FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 129 5 July 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. INF Proposals Denounced as 'Deception' AA 1
[PRAVDA 5 Jul]
Senators Protest U.S. Disarmament Terms AA 2
[PRAVDA 3 Jul]
Reagan Remarks on Nuclear Nonproliferation Hit AA 3
Washington's Nuclear Freeze Stand 'Absurd' AA 3
START Delegate Karpov Meets U.S. Peace Marchers AA 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

IZVESTIYA Editorial Hails Moscow Summit Meeting [1 Jul] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
Moscow, Geneva Meetings CC 1
Carter Election Materials Stolen CC 3
Italian Elections CC 4
Prague, Peace Movements CC 6
CEMA Session Discussed CC 7
Moscow TV's 2 Jul 'Studio 9' Program CC 8
[Zorin, Shishlin, Zhurkin]
Moscow Summit CC 8
Washington's 'Campaign of Smiles' CC 10
'Wave of Conservatism' Questioned CC 13
Capitalist 'Unity' Discussed CC 14
Mideast Situation CC 16
European Problems CC 16
East-West Relations CC 18
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 20
[Kachanov, Kovalev, Belyayev]
Latest Peace Initiatives CC 20
Anti-Zionist Committee CC 22
Moscow Summit, U.S. Conduct Contrasted CC 25
[Vladimirskiy in PRAVDA 1 Jul]
U.S., PRC Comment on Recent Moscow Summit CC 28
[PRAVDA 1 Jul]

SOUTH ASIA

Shultz Assures U.S. Support for Indian Unity D 1
Greeted by Protests [PRAVDA 1 Jul] D 1
Talks With Gandhi, Rao D 1
Shultz Press Conference D 2
To Balance Regional Strength [Alov] D 3
Departs; Differences Remain D 4
Shultz Pakistan Visit to Focus on Afghanistan D 4
Arrival in Pakistan D 4
Pakistan 'Frontline State' D 4
Backing for Afghan 'Bandits' [Biryukov] D 5

WESTERN EUROPE

FRG's Kohl, Genscher in Moscow on Official Visit G 1
Visit Previewed G 1
'An Important Event' [Ostrogorskiy] G 2
Welcomed by Tikhonov G 3
Andropov Cancels Scheduled Meeting [AFP] G 4
Talks With Tikhonov 4 Jul G 4
Kremlin Dinner Held G 6
Talks with Tikhonov 5 Jul G 6
Andropov, Kohl Meet G 7
'Deadlock' Reported [AFP] G 7
Gromyko, Genscher Meet G 8
FRG Reportage [cross-reference] G 8
U.S. Vice President's W. Europe Tour Continues G 8
Observer on Norway Visit G 8
Visits Finland; Dinner Held G 9
Leaves Finland for Denmark G 10
Danish Visit Critiqued [Serov] G 10
Arrives in Ireland G 11
Zimyanin-Led Delegation Finishes Up Paris Visit G 11
Meets Prime Minister G 11
Talks Conclude G 11

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Shultz Returns for Second Middle Eastern Tour H 1
Mideast Tour Motives Assessed H 1
'Fresh Conspiracy' [Bilyakov] H 1
'Green Light' for Israel H 2
PRAVDA Cites Arab CP Support for Syria [1 Jul] H 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Baltic Military Maneuvers Conclude 4 July V 1
Ustinov Addresses Paratroopers on Readiness V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jul]
Ogarkov Heads Editors of Military Dictionary V 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]

U.S. INF PROPOSALS DENOUNCED AS 'DECEPTION'

PM041640 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "A Preprogramm i Impasse"; words in uppercase printed in boldface]

[Text] We are now into the second month since the latest round of Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe began in Geneva. People living not only on the European Continent but also far beyond its confines are impatiently awaiting good news from there.

But unfortunately, the good news has not arrived. The question arises: What is the matter; why has there been no progress at the talks? This question is especially legitimate because the whole world knows about the steps taken by the Soviet side aimed at reaching agreement.

But, after all, for agreement to be possible there has to be the desire for it on both sides, and not just on one of the sides -- the Soviet Union -- in this particular cast.

And so desire is lacking on the other side. The American side strives vainly to demonstrate, verbally, its "flexibility": America, you see, is prepared to reconcile itself to any sum total of nuclear warheads on medium-range missiles -- equal for the United States and the USSR -- be it 50, 100 or 300 each.

This might even seem attractive to an uninformed person: it would seem as if the equality of the sides is ensured and the number of missiles, by mutual desire, could be reduced to a minimum.

But when this is checked out, it all proves to be no more than an optical illusion. And one can easily see this for oneself if one takes the trouble to take a look at what lurks behind the juggling with the aforementioned missile numbers.

First of all, by citing numbers equal for both sides the Americans are in reality leading matters in the direction whereby these numbers would signify for the United States an opportunity to INCREASE its nuclear arsenal in Europe by the relevant number of missiles, while for the USSR it would mean the DESTRUCTION of all its medium-range missiles over and above the number that will be deployed by the United States.

Second, the United States meanwhile continues to pretend that there are on the NATO side neither British nor French missiles, when these in fact total over 160 -- several times more if we count warheads. Naturally the USSR cannot fail to take these into account.

Third, the United States also completely "forgets" its own medium-range facilities kept in the European zone -- in the order of 700 nuclear weapon-carrying aircraft.

Fourth, as though in a special effort to make its position even more absurd and unacceptable to the Soviet Union, the United States insists on also including in the overall limit -- identical for both countries -- the Soviet medium-range missiles which are deployed in the eastern part of the USSR and which have nothing to do with Europe.

Can it come as any surprise after all this that the impasse continues at the talks in Geneva? This impasse has been deliberately programmed by Washington in order to avoid reaching an understanding, which would hamper the deployment of the new American missiles in Europe.

The United States shuns no deception for the sake of achieving this aim -- its entire position is constructed on that. It obviously calculates that, when the deception becomes clear to everyone, it will be the Europeans who have, so to speak, to pay the price, since by that time the American missiles will already be in their backyards. But these are shortsighted, dangerous calculations -- such a turn of events will benefit no one, even across the ocean.

SENATORS PROTEST U.S. DISARMAMENT TERMS

PM041504 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent A. Tolkunov dispatch: "A Poor Grade Not Just in Arithmetic"]

[Text] New York, 2 Jul -- Official Washington has again revealed itself to be a fierce opponent of constructive agreements on strategic arms limitation and reduction on the basis of the sides' equality and identical security.

In a letter to C. Percy, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has stated quite bluntly that in response to the non-creation of 100 MX missiles, the White House is demanding that the Soviet Union dismantle its ground-launched SS ICBM's.

This approach, clearly aimed at disrupting the talks, has caused a storm of protest from senators. After all, many of them at the end of May supported the allocation of appropriations for the further development of the MX only after the administration had given solemn assurances that it would take rapid and positive steps at the Geneva strategic arms limitation and reduction talks.

However, as K. Adelman's letter has again shown, the White House's much-publicized "new peace initiatives" have proved to be nothing more than a political bluff. Calling the conditions for the abandonment of MX unrealistic, Senator W. Cohen has stated: "I am sure that the Soviet Union will reject this proposal."

"Adelman's letter," Senator J. Biden from Delaware has said angrily, "exposes the administration's stance on this problem. After all, it is stating that we will make certain concessions only if the other side abandons everything." That is why, his colleague P. Tsongas concludes, people no longer believe that the White House is sincerely striving for nuclear arms control.

In an attempt to stifle the scandal which has broken out, White House representatives have hastened to state that the senators have misunderstood Mr Adelman. He is not demanding the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament but has simply...expressed himself badly. "Rubbish," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes. "Officials state that Adelman has accurately formulated the position of the administration, which is demanding greater reductions from Moscow than even the U.S. delegation at the talks has demanded."

That is why, having forgotten the basics not only of arithmetic but also of political science, the White House is trying to deceive public opinion by presenting its desire for military superiority as a "constructive stance." Such hypocrisy even anger the White House's own legislators.

REAGAN REMARKS ON NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION HIT

LD020838 Moscow TASS in English 0818 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Alexandr Lyuty reports:

President Reagan made on Friday [1 July] a statement in connection with the 15th anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which bears the signatures of 119 states, including the United States. The head of the American Administration hypocritically called for pooling the efforts in the struggle against proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world and called upon the countries which had not yet signed the treaty, to do so.

The real deeds of the Reagan administration, however, show that it considers the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, just as many other important international obligations, as nothing but a piece of paper. According to the journal NATION, the moment this government came to power in 1980, it has been steadily undermining the basic principles of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Washington is known to be actively cooperating in the nuclear sphere with such countries as the Republic of South Africa, Israel and Pakistan which openly seek development of nuclear weapons.

According to the American press, the companies "Combustion Engineering"; "Westinghouse Electric" and "Foxbord" are broadening, with official Washington's knowledge and encouragement, deliveries of nuclear materials and technology to pro-American regimes. These deals are financed by the U.S. Export-Import Bank. The "Westinghouse" Corporation, for instance, sold several nuclear reactors to the racist Republic of South Africa and maintains close links with Pakistan in the nuclear sphere. The United States grants to Israel hundreds of millions of dollars to purchase nuclear raw materials and relevant equipment.

Commenting on the President's report on the administration's policy in the sphere of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which was submitted to Congress in May, the UPI points out that the White House is now undertaking heightened attempts to relax restrictions on export of nuclear technology, which were introduced by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Moreover, that competent international organization is attacked in the President's report.

WASHINGTON'S NUCLEAR FREEZE STAND 'ABSURD'

LD011416 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 1 Jul 83

["Stop Slipping Down to Nuclear War" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

With the whole complexity of nuclear problems in the present-day world, two possible trends in the field of nuclear disarmament can be singled out: reduction of nuclear weapons down to their total scrapping, or a continuation of the build-up of nuclear arsenals. All sane people the world over, irrespective of their political views, are rejecting the nuclear arms race as a path leading to a world catastrophe, and declare for the scrapping of all means of mass destruction. But under the present-day conditions a freeze on all types of nuclear weapons by all countries having them would be a considerable step forward towards eliminating the nuclear threat.

When two trains are running full speed ahead towards each other on the same track, a collision can be, naturally, averted only by bringing both trains to a halt. After that it will be possible to resolve in a calm atmosphere the question in what direction and in what sequence each of the trains shall be taken away from that track.

The implementation of the Soviet Union's proposals addressed to the United States, Britain, France and the PRC that the powers having nuclear weapons should freeze all of their nuclear weapons quantatively and qualitatively would create favourable conditions for an effective stabilisation of a military-political situation in the world and lessen the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Government considers it possible that first that freeze should be affected by the USSR and the USA on condition that the other nuclear powers should act likewise.

The Soviet Union by no means considers a freeze to be an aim in itself, but views this measure as an effective first step towards reducing and, in the long run, completely liquidating nuclear weapons and thus eliminating the threat of nuclear war in general.

The participants in the meeting of party and state leaders of the seven socialist countries in Moscow have expressed conviction that it is necessary in the interests of peace and security to effect immediately a freeze on the nuclear weapons of all the nuclear powers, above all the USSR and the USA.

Unfortunately, Washington's first reaction is by no means indicative of a constructive approach of the official circles of the USA to the Soviet proposal. Thus, Romberg, a spokesman for the U.S. State Department, made an absurd statement that the implementation of the Soviet proposal would allegedly lead away from the task of holding talks on arms cuts. But the refusal of the biggest capitalist power to halt timely the dangerous developments in the military field and agree to a freeze on nuclear weapons would considerably undermine the possibility of reaching an agreement on a reduction of nuclear systems, threatening the existence of life on earth.

START DELEGATE KARPOV MEETS U.S. PEACE MARCHERS

LD042317 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] At the USSR Permanent Mission at the UN offices in Geneva, a meeting took place between Karpov, the head of the USSR delegation to the Soviet-American talks now in progress on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, and a delegation of Americans that arrived there in the course of a peace march through many countries. In the course of the conversation, the USSR representative told of the latest peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, and of the USSR's position on the question of the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, abating the present tension in the world, and disarmament. He stressed that the Soviet delegation in Geneva is doing everything in its power to achieve practical results at the current talks.

(Ingalls), the organizer of the peace march, talking to a TASS correspondent, noted the warm and friendly reception given by Soviet representatives to the delegation of American peace marchers. At the same time, he stressed that the head of the American delegation at the SALT talks had declined to meet the participants in the peace march who had come from the United States.

## IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL HAILS MOSCOW SUMMIT MEETING

PM011453 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Burying the Sword of War"]

[Text] A report on the front pages.... The meeting in Moscow. The leading party and state figures of the seven fraternal countries exchanged opinions on the development of international events recently. A joint statement was adopted.

...Tense newspaper lines, as they say in such cases. But how unusually topical they are, how timely, how long-awaited. What tremendous meaning lies behind these reports. What fervor of feeling and what concentrated content in each point of the statement. After all, it is a case of the main, most sacred thing by which the peoples live. What the future is preparing for them, what the future of our common home -- plant earth -- will be like. Sunny and peaceful? Or will the bright horizon be obscured by the grim veil of nuclear blasts? Sane people cannot fail to ask these questions, irrespective of where they live and what political persuasions they hold.

The very timing of the Moscow meeting makes it a very important event in international life. For you cannot call this time favorable to the development of normal international relations. Moreover, the aggressive actions of the extreme reactionary forces headed by U.S. imperialism have aggravated the international situation to extremely dangerous limits. Blocking virtually all the talks, which can and should lead to the halting of the arms race, the United States and its NATO allies intend this very year to begin the deployment of new missiles with nuclear warheads in the immediate vicinity of the Warsaw Pact countries' borders. The colossal scientific and production potential of the industrially developed Western countries is directed, in considerable part, not toward creation, but destruction. Fundamentally new systems of conventional arms are being created, whose characteristics approximate weapons of mass destruction. The imperialist warmongers now feel hemmed in by their habitual environment: They are trying with increasing persistence to break out into space. Space combat systems are being developed to hit targets in space and on earth. All this and much else, attests irrefutably, that imperialist circles are gambling on a "position-of-strength" policy, a policy of confrontation, and that their aim is to seek military superiority over the USSR and its allies in order to set back and even totally annihilate socialism as a sociopolitical system.

Western propaganda's clumsy attempts to promote the utterly bogus thesis that the NATO bloc's buildup of its military might serves the interests of peace and the peoples' security looks like hypocrisy. Need it be proved, that no weapons can take the place of the olive branch and that no one has yet succeeded in putting out a fire with gasoline? Yet don't the specific practical expose again and again imperialism's lies and hypocrisy? How can statements about a "desire for flexibility" and for "mutual understanding" be reconciled with the constant flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign powers, with the unbridled propaganda warfare, and shameless anti-Sovietism, which blinds them from considering it necessary to observe even a minimum of universally accepted correctness in interstate affairs. No, there is no way of reconciling these things.

But the main point, of course, is that sinister deeds stand behind the familiar rhetoric. The struggle against the threat of war, the demand for peace which people of good will are issuing in many countries and which was heard so powerfully at the Prague World Assembly "For Peace and Life and Against Nuclear War" are assuming particular significance right now, when states have weapons capable of destroying life on earth itself and when the threat of nuclear war has begun to intensify noticeably.

Today, it is a case of halting the frenzied warmongers and defending people's right to life. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is devoted to this noble, humane task according with the aspirations of all peoples. They are the most vigorous and consistent fighters for the consolidation of peace, the relaxation of tension, and broad cooperation with other powers. Our countries are deeply convinced that there are no problems, worldwide or regional, which cannot be resolved by peaceful means. We display this conviction of ours in numerous peace-loving foreign policy steps and initiatives and joint actions in the international arena. The Political Declaration adopted in Prague at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference confirmed the socialist countries' determination to promote, by peaceful initiatives, the elimination of the threat of war and the creation of an atmosphere of confidence in relations between the states. New impetus for resolving complex international problems for the sake of strengthening peace and the peoples' security and continuing the process of the relaxation of international tension is provided by the joint statement adopted at the Moscow meeting of leading party and state figures of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR, and the CSSR.

Those taking part in the meeting made an in-depth, painstaking analysis of the international situation and confirmed the assessments and conclusions contained in the Prague conference Political Declaration. They came to the conclusion that the situation which is taking shape, faces all states and all peoples with the question of how to prevent its further dangerous development, how to prevent the world from sliding toward catastrophe. The statement not only notes the present situation but also, categorically rejecting the path of war for resolving world problems, calls for actions and immediate steps capable of channeling the course of events in the direction of detente.

In this regard, very great significance is tied to the elimination of the threat of nuclear confrontation in Europe. Those taking part in the meeting deem it essential to achieve at least an accord ruling out the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles in the West European countries and providing for appropriate reductions in the medium-range weapons existing in Europe with a view to securing equilibrium at a lower level. Full support was also voiced for the Soviet proposals aimed at a fair reduction of present medium-range nuclear armaments. Confidence was expressed that, if both sides strictly observe the principle of parity and identical security, the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks can be put on a constructive footing.

Those taking part in the meeting are opposed to the militarization of space and favor an immediate freeze on the nuclear arms of all nuclear powers, primarily the USSR and the United States. They are convinced that the nuclear powers which have not yet done so, must undertake to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. Those taking part in the meeting expressed themselves in favor of creating nuclear-free zones in Europe and stressed the importance of an need for the speediest completion of the Madrid meeting with positive results.

The states taking part in the meeting appealed again to the NATO states to begin talks immediately in order not to increase, but subsequently reciprocally reduce military expenditure in the new year. They are awaiting for the NATO countries to agree to embark on a discussion of the suggestion for a treaty -- open to all states -- on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states.

While firmly defending and asserting a peaceful path for the solution of the most complex and acute problems, those taking part in the Moscow meeting stated most resolutely that, proceeding from the interests of peace and their own security, in no circumstances will they allow military superiority to be secured over them. They are in favor of ensuring equilibrium at a lower level. The statement says that the participants in the meeting oppose any steps leading to the expansion of NATO's sphere of the cooperation or the creation of any new military-political groupings. It was also stated that the territorial and political realities of present-day Europe are inviolable.

Soviet people unanimously support the joint statement of the participants in the Moscow meeting and the peace-loving, Leninist foreign policy course of our party and the Soviet government. The working people of the Land of the Soviets are fully determined to strengthen by their labor the might of the fatherland and the entire socialist community for the sake of peace and cooperation among the people.

The news of the Moscow meeting and the joint statement focusing the collective wisdom and collective experience our countries flew round the world instantly. It pushed aside all other events and drew the burning attention of the broadest public, generating enormous and universal interest. "A passionate appeal was heard from Moscow: lose no time to safeguard peace," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND notes. "Those taking part in the meeting," the West German newspaper GENERAL ANZEIGER notes, "appealed to the West for disarmament." "The states taking part in the meeting," THE WASHINGTON POST declares, "stated that in no circumstances will they allow military superiority to be secured over them...."

The voice of reason and hope has again been heard from Moscow, calling on all those who treasure peace to bury the sword of war. The states represented at the meeting expressed their readiness to pool their efforts with the efforts of all countries, irrespective of their sociopolitical systems, and with all those who advocate the consolidation of peace and international security in the interests of taking practical steps to prevent the worst. The time for this should not be let slip, the joint statement urges.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD031658 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 3 Jul 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin international, affairs journalist Nikolay Vladimirovich Shislin, and all-union radio foreign policy commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

Moscow, Geneva Meetings

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade listeners. The meeting in Moscow of leading party and state figures from seven socialist states became an event of paramount political importance this week. As is noted in the CPSU Central Committee Politburo statement, the joint statement adopted at the meeting expresses the unity of approach adopted by the fraternal parties and states in their assessment of the contemporary international situation, and also their desire to join forces in striving to avert the military threat and to consolidate the peace and security of the peoples.

[Bovin] Well, of course every such meeting is in itself important. This meeting is especially important because it takes place within complex international situation. If you recall, the last neeting of the leaders of the socialist countries was at the beginning of this year in Prague, when the well-known Prague joint declaration was adopted. During the past half year, one can say that the needle of the political barometer has, unfortunately, fallen. If one gets down to specifics, one can say that during this period it has become perfectly clear that the United States has passed from words -- that it wishes to achieve superiority over the USSR -- to deeds. Now a situation has virtually come about wherein all these Western political moves, above all the American ones, signify a desire on the part of these reactionary circles to alter the world situation in their favor, and to use this change in order to dictate their will to the USSR. So if one observes everything that is happening there, one gets an impression of this general line.

It was especially important in precisely this situation to gather to discuss this course of events, and to work a unified, strategically integrated approach to what was happening.

[Shishlin] It must be added that the American line at the important talks being held in Geneva is being built in accordance with the line that has already been mentioned here, whether it be the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, or those on strategic weapons. These has essentially been no serious and noticeable progress at these talks.

[Bovin] They now talk about the flexibility which the Americans are showing. But essentially all this flexibility is in words, in formulas, in commas and colons. If one gets down to the nub of things, there is of course no flexibility, and the same old positions are in fact being constantly reiterated.

[Levin] Incidentally, concerning this very flexibility, the Americans have new proposals which express an apparent readiness not to deploy 100 MX missiles, but on condition that the USSR also scraps tow-thirds of its intecontinental missiles.

[Bovin] Yes, this is the whole point, because our main defense potential is precisely in those missiles which the Americans wish to be destroyed, and their main potential is in other parts of the strategic triad, This is the whole point.

[Levin] Even the Americans themselves, in particular Senator Biden, openly say: We are making the point that we are ready to give up something if the Russians relinquish everything. THE WASHINGTON POST, having analyzed the views of leading U.S. specialists on the USSR, came to the conclusion that the new U.S. proposal at the Geneva talks remains fundamentally inadmissible for the talks since this proposal, as before, demands major and very specific reductions in the Soviet missile arsenal, while at the same time demanding only a minor regrouping of U.S. forces. I would say that this is, to a certain extent, the same version of the zero option which they are trying to foist on us at the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, and it is now also being transferred to the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons.

[Bovin] If we return to the meeting held in Moscow, I would like to reemphasize that at this complex and crucial moment in the development of world politics, it is very moment in the development of world politics, it is very important that the leaders of the socialist states and fraternal parties met and confirmed their total unity of action in this situation. What is especially important, if one is more specific, is that they all supported the view that if the Americans start to deploy their nuclear missiles in Europe -- cruise missiles and Pershing II's, then the Warsaw Pact countries, the countries of the socialist community, must take adequate measures to withstand this. This is perhaps the most important military-political part of this statement.

[Shishlin] Yes, and the fact that this decision therefore guarantees that the strategic balance in Europe will not be destroyed. The second part, which is no less vital, is the fact that in these fairly dramatic conditions, the socialist countries have confirmed their constructive line in international affairs.

[Bovin] This is a whole series of concrete measures which can disentangle the present situation and put it again on to the road to detente. We proposed these measures in Prague half a year ago, and we propose them again, but unfortunately the West is not responding to this.

[Shishlin] You have of course noticed that in the West there is at the moment such a well-staged pessimism as records the fate of the European nuclear arms limitation talks: "Well, nothing will come of them anyway so the missiles have to be deployed. The socialist countries adopt a different position: There is a possibility of coming to a mutually acceptable decision if the principle of equality and equal security of the sides is adhered to, a decision that would ensure a really substantial lowering of the level of nuclear weapons now in Europe, for the Warsaw Treaty and NATO.

[Levin] This joint statement says that the states represented at the meeting are firmly convinced that peace cannot be strengthened through the arms race. This is also an extremely appropriate answer to the propagandistic postulates of the Washington administration which state that an arms buildup on the American side is a factor in the strengthening of peace. The socialist countries affirm that they are consistent opponents of the fanning of this arms race. It is emphasized in this document, the joint statement, that only the limitation, reduction, and destruction of weapons, and measures leading to general and total disarmament under strict international control, can bring humanity a firm and reliable peace.

I would like to draw attention again to the fact that this document very clearly expresses a readiness to listen to the other side, and to attentively consider its constructive proposals, and...

[Shishlin -- interrupting] If there are any.

[Levin] Yes, if there are any. It states that we think that it is possible to reach such an agreement, if both sides show mutual understanding and political will, and are guided by broad concepts of peace and security.

[Bovin] If one now considers what the U.S. leaders have been saying during the past 4-6 weeks, I would say that a peace-loving tone predominates. They are also talking about peace and disarmament, about this and that, but the beginning of the election campaign for a new U.S. president is clearly discernible throughout. We have seen all this a thousand times. Reagan needs to earn some points, and if he won points through his pugnaciousness in the preceding elections, he has now so frightened Americans that this act will not work, and he is trying to change his tone and to win his political capital through discourses on peace and disarmament. This is very characteristic now of the situation in America.

[Shishlin] Reagan is trying to prove that all these massive programs for increasing arms will bring about a situation where the USSR will become more complaint, and under the threat of the new U.S. missiles will agree to large cuts in arms and armed forces -- in all, as it were, aspects of the disarmament talks which in one way or another we are conducting with the United States. That is, he wants to show that there can be movement toward disarmament while at the same time building up arms -- some kind of totally paradoxical movement which cannot lead to anything other than a new spiral of the arms race, to new alarm in the world, and to an increase of those dangers that exist today.

## Carter Election Materials Stolen

[Levin] Now, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you mentioned the election campaign. This is making itself felt, and the struggle in the United States is becoming increasingly keen. In this connection, I should like to mention the political scandal which is assuming the nature of a political fire in Washington, as some American newspapers are already putting it.

[Bovin] Yes, a second Watergate -- such a concept in already being used.

[Levin] "Cartergate" is another expression. Our radio listeners know the essence of what went on -- it has come to light that during the previous election campaign people from the Reagan team managed to steal a whole series of very important documents belonging to the arsenal of the team handling Carter's election campaign, and used these documents to defeat Carter.

[Bovin] That is to say, in concrete terms it concerns the scenario for Carter's speeches -- so, shall we say, if Reagan says such and such, then Carter must say such and such. The tactics for discussion were written down.

[Levin] For the television discussion.

[Bovin] Yes, and all these tactics feel into Reagan's hands. He of course made use of them.

[Levin] He made use of them, and he is considered to have made very successful use of them. One's attention is drawn first and foremost, however, to the reaction of Reagan himself when this was first widely reported in the American press. Reports of the actual theft of the documents had appeared earlier, but not much was made of them. Now, that the hulaballoo started to assume a particularly threatening nature, however, Reagan stated on 25 June: This is all a lot of fuss about nothing, and tried to brush off the entire affair.

On the very same day, White House spokesman Larry Speakes declared that, from a political viewpoint, there was nothing new in it, for that's the way politics is conducted. That is evidently the way that American politics is conducted. On 27 June THE WASHINGTON POST published a feature based on the documents which had been stolen from the Democrats by the Republicans. Carter's people put copies of these documents at the newspaper's disposal, and the comparison of these documents with what Reagan said was very indicative. I shall cite one example here: In the section of the documents under the heading of the social welfare system, there was a forecast that Reagan's policy as president would harm the aged. Carter was to press home that point. During the discussion, however, no sooner had Carter gotten this phrase out than Reagan seized the initiative and declared: But I am in favor of such and such and this will be better for aged citizens. A textual coincidence, that is. A large number of similar instances are cited.

[Shishlin] The real point, though, is evidently not so much these facts themselves, as that a pretty dark shadow has been cast over the reputation of the White House, for Reagan has always tried to make himself out to be a politician whose hands are clean in comparison with the previous administration which had got themselves thoroughly embroiled. Today, however -- we will not say that it is catastrophic for Reagan in his apparent intention to stand for a second term -- but it is a substantial burden for him.

[Levin] At the same time, this fact illuminates once again the atmosphere of politics in the United States. At his press conference on 28 June Reagan was asked several times what he thought about the ethical aspect of the affair.

[Bovin] He was taken aback to start with.

[Levin] First of all he was taken aback, and then he ran round in circles like a hare and said the first thing that came into his head. They kept on asking him, however, about the ethical aspect of the affair. Finally, when the question was asked quite directly, Reagan pretended he had not heard: I beg your pardon? Tell us, sir, about the ethical side of the affair. As regards ethics, Reagan said, it seems to me that according to current opinion, double standards are always permitted in election campaigns, and I am sorry about that. No answer was given. The very lack of an answer is perhaps the most convincing and clear one, demonstrating that there really are no political ethics in the ruling circles in the United States.

It seems to me, too, that it is not accidental that during the same press conference, speaking about the situation in Central America, Reagan said literally that El Salvador and Guatemala themselves want to establish democracy in their countries and to continue to proceed along the path on which they are travelling now. According to Reagan, they need us -- that is, the United States -- to help them with training and supplies of arms and munitions so that they can defend themselves while carrying out these democratic programs. What kind of democratic programs are these? During Rios Montt's rule, since March of last year to the present, over 12,000 people have been killed in Guatemala and 15,000 have been declared missing by the authorities. The country's population amounts to 7.3 million. In the past 3 years, over 42,000 people have been killed in El Salvador out of a population of 4.5 million. Such is the democracy supported by the United States which it wants to implant not only in El Salvador and Guatemala, but which it is also trying to impose through its henchmen upon Nicaragua.

## Italian Elections

[Bovin] Since you mentioned the forthcoming elections in America, perhaps it would be worth talking about the elections held recently in Italy.

[Levin] Of course, they are also very interesting.

[Bovin] In general, the Christian Democrat Party there wanted to repeat Thatcher's maneuver and hold early elections in order to strengthen its political position and free its hands. Unlike Thatcher, however, they miscalculated, and the resulting picture turned out to be a completely unexpected one for the Christian Democrat Party. They lost 55 seats in Parliament, overall, in the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. This produced something of a political earthquake in Italy.

[Shishlin] In the view of the Italians themselves, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, the election results will mark the beginning of the end of the domination of the Christian Democrat Party in the political arena.

[Bovin] I would not say so. Italy has a different structure. There is no balancing force there which might oppose, say, the Christian Democrat Party amongst the bourgeois or Social Democratic parties. The situation there is like this: Political life is very polarized. On the one hand there is the strongest Communist Party in West Europe. It has, moreover, now lost five seats. On the other hand, the neofascist party has now become the strongest one. Furthermore, it won another 17 seats in these elections. This was a surprise for everyone, incidentally.

[Shishlin] By the way, Enrico Berlinguer, the leader of the Italian communists, gave a very interesting evaluation of the election results. He put it like this: We have managed to shake the tree thoroughly, but the fruits which have fallen have been picked up not so much by us as by others.

[Bovin] No, they have picked up nothing at all. The votes which streamed away from the Christian Democrats, so to speak, did not go to the communists, but went either to the extreme right-wing opposition or to different parties of the middle who proposed a palliative type of policy, such as the Social Democrats or the liberals.

[Shishlin] There is another characteristic feature there: Earlier the difference in the votes cast for the Christian Democrat Party and the Communist Party amounted to 3 million, whereas in these elections the differences in the votes cast was 800,000. This made itself felt.

[Bovin] Yes, this made itself felt. This situation at the moment is like this, however: Neither the Christian Democrats nor the Communists have a majority in parliament such as would allow them to comfortably form a government. The communists idea of a democratic alternative demands a coalition with the socialists; the socialists will not agree to such a coalition. The idea does not work at the moment. All the same, the Christian Democrats must build some sort of coalition.

[Shishlin] Like they had before, of five parties.

[Bovin] Yes, like they had before. I think, however, that since they have lost a considerable number of seats, the new government in Rome will be even less stable than the previous one. What is happening is that a few days before the elections a conference of conservative parties from all over the world gathered in London. Representatives of 22 conservative parties were there. Bush was there from America, Thatcher, Kohl, and Strauss, the prime ministers of Norway and Denmark, and all the rest were all there. They took the opportunity to found the so-called International Democratic Union of all conservative parties there. It was said there with some feeling that there is a sort of wave and surge of conservatism throughout the world, and that only their decisions and their program can save capitalism and withstand communism -- all the same old political mythology that we all know so well.

The Italian elections which took place 2 days later confirmed in quite a dramatic fashion that all that was said there is far from being the case. It must indeed be admitted that in recent years there has been a certain upsurge in such a conservative mood in various countries.

[Shishlin] For various reasons.

[Bovin] Yes, for various reasons, but the main reason amounts to the fact that former governments have not yet been able to cope with those very difficult problems which capitalism is facing, and now the conservatives are trying to do this and I am confident that they, too, will not have any success. But alongside a general movement to the right we see such things as the elections in Greece, Spain, and France, and now the failure of the Christian Democrats in Italy, which indicate that there is a different tendency in existence too -- it is less vividly expressed at the moment, but it exists, and I think that the political pendulum, which on the whole has now moved somewhat to the right, will inevitably move in the opposite direction.

[Shishlin] Of course it will not stand still because, quite simply, the movement of a pendulum presupposes that.

Prague, Peace Movements

[Levin] I think that to a certain extent, to a quite definite extent, the postulates that were voiced at the conference of these conservative forces are not confirmed in a whole range of other events too. Those events that indicate that it is far from conservative -- to put it mildly -- tendencies which are setting the tone in the world include the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" which has taken place in Prague.

[Bovin] This was of course an impressive spectacle, an outward spectacle. I was there and saw it all, I took part in it, it was an impressive spectacle. But on this occasion I want to talk about the political meaning of what took place.

For the first time at such a broad forum different antiwar movements met -- on the one hand those which are generally grouped around the World Peace Council, and on the other those which stress their independence from that organization and which act, so to speak, on their own initiative and responsibility. Between them -- but they are all of them, both of them, opposed to war. Both of them are in favor of disarmament, and so on and so forth. But there is a very substantial difference because one side considers that the main cause of international tension is the policy of imperialism, primarily that of the Americans, while the other says no: both America and the Soviet Union are equally guilty, that is to say, they put us and the Americans on the same level. Both sides have been taking part in the assembly. This was extremely interesting because one has to learn to listen not just to one's own opinion, but to listen to the voice of one's opponent, one has to learn how to reply to arguments. While I was sitting there I heard for the thousand and first time those banalities which are put up against us, and one needed patience in order to avoid retaliating with an epithet of some kind but instead to begin fencing with them using argument, reasoning, and evidence -- they, too, listen to this, and one cannot always immediatedly change their minds, but one can sow the seeds of doubt in some way and make them think about the truth of the political myths in which they believe. This is exactly what was done at the assembly. It has to be said that the majority of people who were there were indeed sincere champions of peace, progress, and democracy, and in the end an excellent call was adopted. Those who came in search of scandals of one kind or another managed to do nothing at all there. Some of them merely left; they did not stand the test, and as they tried to impose their point of view it encountered a rebuff from the overwhelming majority there.

[Shishlin] Almost in parallel with this world conference, a conference of doctors in defense of peace was taking place, and its decisions were also quite consonant with the conclusions made in the Czechoslovak capital.

[Bovin] Yes, the situation now is such that people are realizing more and more that one must not just wait for governments to solve certain things, but that one must not just wait for governments to solve certain things, but that one must get actively involved in politics, wage a political offensive, exert pressure on those forces which want to bring mankind to disaster. This is a very important point, a very important sign of our time -- the growth of the antiwar and antimilitarist movement.

[Shishlin] No doubt the things we have been talking about here, those peace-loving postures which the United States has been taking up from time to time over the past few months are also linked, of course, with the atmosphere which is coming into being in the United States in connection with the military danger and with the overall European, worldwide situation, which is characterized by a buildup in the mass movements in defense of peace, in defense of international security.

[Bovin] The Americans, of course, are trying to defend themselves in every way, and to attack for purposes of defense. Take, for example, the journey of Shultz and the journey of Bush through Europe.

[Levin] Yes, this is the advertizing of American policy.

[Bovin] They are trying to advertise it, and, what's more, they are trying to do so in peace-loving tones. Take a look at Bush or at Shultz and you certainly don't think that just 2 years ago Reagan was saying such terrible things about war. No.

[Shishlin] Reagan himself is now stating that nuclear war is unthinkable, that it is a war in which there will be no victors. That is to say, he is taking up a point of view which, it would seem, clearly contradicts the practical doctrines which are being worked out by the American military -- I am speaking about all these doctrines about a limited nuclear war, about a protracted nuclear war, and so on.

[Bovin] In general, if one is to judge by the way in which Bush was received in the FRG for example, when objects of every description were hurled at his car, people do not give a great deal of credence to these honeyed arguments of the Americans because they really do see the things they do, and they judge by deeds and not by the words which are now being uttered.

## CEMA Session Discussed

[Levin] All this does indeed create a great deal of verbosity in international politics, and I should like to return once again to the Moscow meeting and to recall that the unity and the cohesion of the socialist states are, under these conditions, particularly meaningful and particularly important. In this connection I would like to mention, briefly, yet another event which took place this week. A session of the CEMA Executive Committee has taken place at which the expansion of cooperation was discussed between the CEMA member-countries in the field of the rational use of fuel and power and raw materials resources, and also in the improvement of supplies of food products to the population. Other questions, too, were discussed there, but there were the main questions. The socialist countries have achieved notable successes in the development of their cooperation which help them to solve complicated economic problems which have been placed before literally the whole world. This cooperation, in the field of the rational use of fuel and power and raw materials resources in particular, is being realized upon the basis of a long-term program for that purpose.

In particular, great attention is being given to the development of nuclear power generation. It is known that by the year 1990 it is intended to build nuclear power stations with a total capacity of about 37 million kilowatts in European countries and in Cuba, and also two nuclear power stations, each of a 4 million kilowatt capacity, on the territory of the Soviet Union. As a result we calculate that the annual production of electricity at nuclear power stations will be equivalent to approximately 70 million of standard fuel in 1990 in CEMA member-countries without taking into account the Soviet Union. This too, is a very great and important result.

[Bovin] Perhaps one ought to stress yet again the fact that all these decisions and all these ways that you have just been talking about can only be realized if there is going to be peace in the world. So there is, therefore, no task more important at this critical moment we are living through, there is no task in my view that is more important, more topical, more responsible than that of maintaining peace and of preventing war. This is the main line, the line on which our foreign policy is operating.

[Levin] In conclusion I would recall yet another point from the document of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the Moscow meeting. It stresses that throughout the world practical steps are awaited that are capable of preventing the worst. The socialist countries are proposing such steps, they are setting them out in precise and concrete terms, and they are waiting for a reply from the West. Our time, comrades, has run out. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

MOSCOW TV'S 2 JUL 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW020757 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0815 GMT 2 Jul 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Prof Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Prof Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you again in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center to discuss topical problems of world politics. Today we have in our studio political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Prof Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Moscow Summit

There is no doubt that the Moscow meeting of socialist country leaders has become the most important political event not only of the past week but of recent times in general. This is affirmed particularly by all the statements in the world press in recent days in which many bourgeois political observers attempted to portray the Moscow meeting as a singular [svoyeobraznyy] reply by the socialist countries to the meeting of the seven leaders of capitalist countries in the U.S. city of Williamsburg and the subsequent NATO council session in Paris.

I think that such an interpretation of the Moscow meeting is to a great extent an oversimplification of the matter. If you look at the documents of the Williamsburg and Paris meetings and read them carefully, you will see that the participants in these Western meetings primarily concerned themselves with immediate and present-day problems -- important problems, but problems of today. If we took the trouble to carefully read the document of the Moscow meeting, we would see that although it gives present-day problems the most paramount significance, it also talks about long-term problems.

It talks not only about the tactics but also about the political strategy of socialist countries, solutions which will be significant both in the immediate period -- in the days ahead -- and which will influence the long-term period.

I would like to turn your attention to a certain curious circumstance. When one reads commentaries of many Western newspapers on the Moscow meeting, one is struck by what I would call a certain incongruity. Certain observers and political figures say that the Moscow meeting document maintains an intentionally harsh tone. Others, on the contrary, say that this document, as they express it, extends an olive branch to the West. These are the assessments, and I would even call them mutually exclusive assessments. Nikolay Vladimirovich, what is your view of the reality of the situation?

[Shishlin] I do not think there is a simple answer to this question, it simply does not exist. The joint statement gives a strict assessment of the present international situation; one, of course, which is free of an artificial dramatization of the situation, but I repeat, a strict assessment. The leaders of the socialist states naturally could not have overlooked the dangerous plans that NATO is striving to implement. I mean plans for deploying new U.S. nuclear missile assets on the territory of a number of West European states. We know that the United States counts on being able to deploy both the first group of Pershing missiles at the end of year -- 9 missiles in West Germany -- and to deploy 16 cruise missiles each in Great Britain and Italy.

However, we get the impression that the United States, at least presently, does not want to hold back its deployment of Pershing and Tomahawk missiles across the ocean, does not want to apply the brakes to its plan. Naturally, this kind of line threatens to overturn the strategic balance in Europe and to seriously undermine international security as such. Moreover, The United States has now set in motion the idea -- generally it is not a very new one -- that the implementation of NATO's plans for so-called rearmament supposedly will strongly motivate the Soviet Union to accept one-sided U.S. proposals to the detriment of its own security and the security of its friends. It seems to me that the Moscow statement, in particular, will help to rid them of the illusion that the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty member-states will simply take into consideration the U.S. activities and will not concern themselves about their own security and will not concern themselves with the reliable security of the socialist community. It will not be so. The Moscow statement quite definitely and clearly states that appropriate measures will be taken by socialist countries if NATO's plans are realized.

However, this is not the end of it, not the end of it, because you are quite right, Valentin Sergeyevich, when you say that the Moscow statement also expressed a type of peace strategy conducted by the socialist countries, and this peace strategy essentially -- if we apply it to the current year -- began with the Prague Political Declaration of Warsaw Treaty member-states and was newly developed in the Moscow statement. This applies to all talks that are being held on disarmament problems: strategic weapons talks, talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, and the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and weapons in central Europe.

I admit that I would not like to think that the United States can act after the Moscow meeting just by consulting the Californian church calendar. [kalifornivskiye svyatsy] No, they will be obliged to examine the position of their partners and not be flattered by the banal applause directed either at U.S. firmness or U.S. flexibility, or directed at both together. I think that the United States will have to very seriously weigh the joint position of socialist states and consider the capabilities of socialist states, the practical capabilities.

Another point. I think one should not equate the month of July with November and December. After all, July is not November and December and there is still time, although it is, of course, running out. Therefore, I think that the Moscow statement could by itself become a reference point for energetic activities directed at searching for broad mutually acceptable solutions which would change the course of events and slow down, or more precisely, turn back the current tendency toward intensifying tension.

Washington's 'Campaign of Smiles'

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, when you talk about November and December, I would like to remind our television viewers that we are talking about the fact that in precisely this period NATO's so-called double decision proposes the deployment of intermediate-range missiles. Now you mentioned not only U.S. rigidity but also U.S. flexibility. Regarding this phrase of yours, I would like to pose this question: It is indeed curious -- it is impossible not to notice this -- that recently Washington has very actively demonstrated some sort of real flexibility. Not so much demonstrated as desired to demonstrate.

[Shishlin] Imitated.

[Zorin] Yes, imitated. As certain observers call it, a certain campaign of smiles directed at the Soviet Union is being implemented. Various declarations are made about good will and about the desire to improve relations. If we were talking about some sort of newspaper statements or about individual statements, one could ignore them entirely. However, we are talking about the facts that these declarations are being made at quite a high level and also by people surrounding the President. Moreover, these declarations have become numerous. Generally, it resembles a campaign, a campaign which is typical of recent times. Vitaliy Vladimirovich, I would like to ask you to try to analyze what is really behind this. Do certain reassessments in fact exist, or is it something else?

[Zhurkin] Recently Vice President Bush appeared on television in the FRG and used the word flexibility so often that I deliberately counted them. Talking about the U.S. position at the Geneva talks, he used it four times in one sentence, and at a time when it is well known that the Americans are unbending. The President has also started talking about making peace, not to mention U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. Even Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has also learned to squeeze out the word peace from time to time, and not only in regard to the Peacekeeper missile -- the MX missile which, I must say, was named with awful cynicism -- but also with regard to his President, who, he says, is the ultimate peacekeeper.

What is all this? Does this signal progress in the U.S. position or cosmetics, makeup. One would not want this to be cosmetics. One would want real progress in positions to occur. Naturally, however, there is nothing in actual practice, in real life. Nikolay Vladimirovich, as you said, the deployment of intermediate-range missiles is planned and preparations for this are underway. There is no progress in the U.S. position at the talks but merely attempts to achieve the unilateral disarmament of the Soviet Union.

Recently, the latest embarrassment to the administration occurred in Congress. Adelman, the director of the Arms and Disarmament Control Agency, was asked: Could the United States not deploy 100 MX missiles and in exchange for this demand something from the Soviet Union? He sent a written reply: Yes, of course. Let the Soviet Union destroy all its heavy and medium intercontinental ballistic missiles. Even the congressmen, who are accustomed to all sorts of things, waved their arms and there was much noise in Congress on this occasion.

Not to mention that the economic and psychological war against the socialist community is continuing. In other words, words do not correspond to deeds. It is true that there is a difference in cosmetics. If you remember, the Reagan administration began with words corresponding to deeds and military preparations were directly and frankly discussed. You remember that in his first major foreign policy speech at West Point the President said: We should not be thinking about scraps of paper but should argue about which comparative weapons systems to press on with.

[Zorin] by scraps of paper he meant international agreements.

[Zhurkin] Yes, that is how it was expressed. International agreements are scraps of parchment or scraps of paper.

Moreover, at the time the President cited his sincere friend, (Lawrence Billenson), whom no one had ever heard about. But an American correspondent, Robert Scheer, recently wrote a book about Reagan's presidency in which he relates that soon after this correspondents rushed around to find this (Billenson), found a hale 82-year-old man near Los Angeles, California. They asked him: Do you share the President's views? He said: Yes, our views are very similar. What is your credo? (Billenson) said: My credo is simple: We must try to overthrow every communist government on the planet. So that the correspondents would have no doubts, he said: And the Chinese and Yugoslav governments, also. He was asked: Does the President think this way as well? He said: I don't know how he will conduct his foreign policy in practice, but he essentially shares my views. That is how it was at the beginning of the current administration's government. Today the cosmetics, the makeup, are changing.

[Shishlin] Vitaliy Vladimirovich, this is generally reminiscent of a hero in Carroll's fairytale, Alice in Wonderland. You remember that there is a Cheshire cat in it who melts in the air leaving only a grin, but there was nothing real.

[Zorin] You see, it seems that circumstances force these smiles. At first it was considered that one could directly and frankly express what one thought, but now it seems they are trying to delude both American and international public opinion. However, I would like to add the following thought to what you have said. Smiles are indeed like the Cheshire cat's grin, intangible things, but there are things that are quite material. For example, during Reagan's term in power, enormous military orders have been placed and multimillion-dollar military programs have been launched. Moreover, this is not a subject of debate in Congress. They have been launched and are being implemented and smiles will not cancel this. I would just like to cite one figure for our television viewers. Last year the U.S. Defense Department concluded contracts with military corporations for totaling of $116.7 billion. No one can seriously suppose that these orders can be revoked and that the companies will return monies to the U.S. treasury for the weapons they are now producing. But these funds are not simply money, they are weapons systems which are entering arsenals. Therefore, in view of the fact that the U.S. Government has already launched these military programs, it is frankly difficult to trust the smiles and declarations of flexibility.

[Zhurkin] Valentin Sergeyevich, it is true that certain programs are struggling with considerable difficulty. Generally, everything does not go through that easily. Recently, the two houses of Congress -- the Senate and the House of Representatives -- decided to halve the increase in military expenditures in the 1984 budget. I would like to say that the opposition to military programs by Americans themselves is ever-increasing.

The World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" ended recently in Prague. More than 100 Americans attended, people with various convictions and various religious views.

A meeting was held between the Soviet and American delegations and all the Americans, without exception, expressed great concern about U.S. military programs and the arms race. They openly stated that fear is growing in the United States in the face of the danger of nuclear war.

[Shishlin] Vitaliy Vladimirovich, all the same, one must agree with the fact that both the Senate and the House of Representatives, having voted for the budget which is being called a direct blow at the very heart of Reaganomics, in a few days, and by an overwhelming margin, released funds for the creation of the B-1 strategic bomber. And....

[Zhurkin -- interrupting] Specifically for the MS... MX.

[Shishlin] Yes, MX.

[Zhurkin] They apportioned....

[Shishlin -- interrupting] ...or if we take their approach to socialist countries. Not only does the United States conduct a definite line in the military sphere but, you know, in economic matters it is always striving to harden the West's credit policies regarding socialist states and to constrict the trade opportunities in modern equipment and modern technology. Politically, they act as though the United States possesses the right to recommend to and demand from the socialist states how they should conduct their affairs and how their policies should be constructed.

Take the recent visit by the pope to Poland. You know that the bells of the Western mass media pealed louder than all the bells in Poland -- and there are enough of them there. Moreover, they pealed in every tone possible. The Vatican organ L'OBSERVATORE ROMANO declared that the papal visit was a masterpiece of evenhandedness [ravnovesiye] and certain newspapers in the West asserted that this was nothing but a victorious crusade by Pope John Paul II to the East.

However, perhaps the voice of the President shouted down all the bells when he addressed Americans of Polish descent in Chicago. These, again, were arrogant lectures to a sovereign socialist state; these, again, were extremely unfriendly, or more accurately, simply hostile attacks on the Soviet Union and the socialist world. It is obvious that in the West they wanted to utilize the visit by the head of the Catholic Church against the interests of the Polish People's Republic. This is indisputable. It is no news that the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland is great, and this was confirmed. But something else was also confirmed, and this was noticed in the West: the Polish People's Republic is gradually, with difficulty, step by step, overcoming the difficult consequences of the political and economic crisis. The path of overcoming these difficulties for People's Poland, of course, would have been much shorter if not for this hostile line of the West which strives to utilize any opportunity to complicate the Polish situation.

However, I have not forgotten the questions that we are discussing, the question of whether this is a cosmetic change or not. I agree with Vitaliy Vladimirovich that the posture... the fashion of these military postures in Washington is beginning to weaken, but not disappearing. They are beginning to weaken. After all, it is natural that the makeup is applied in a certain way. They are not painting the face of Mars now but something more tranquil and attractive. We will have to wait and see what takes shape. Now it is more on the level of gestures.

'Wave of Conservatism' Questioned

[Zorin] I would like to continue our conversation on the following subject. Perhaps it is the trip I have just returned from that gives rise to it. I was in Great Britain during the parliamentary elections when the Conservative Party retained power. Before this, elections were held in another major European country, the FRG, when the government headed by Kohl come to power. This series of events gave rise to talk by Western political experts about a shift to the right in public opinion and a certain wave of conservatism in Western countries. I do not think that this is an abstract problem but bears a direct relation to the topic of our talk today. Is there a wave of conservatism or not?

[Shishlin] Valentin Sergeyevich, I would like to break your monopoly on the questions.

[Zorin] Yes.

[Shishlin] What did you yourself feel, how did the British regard the election results?

[Zorin] If we talk about my impression, I think that simply a series of political coincidences advantageous to Margaret Thatcher and her party caused this victory. Namely, disorder in her opponent's camp, complete disorder among the Labour Party members and among the Social Democrats and Liberals. There was also the suddenness with which the elections were scheduled and her opponents did not have time to prepare. I think that while there may be great rejoicing today at 10 Downing Street regarding the elections, a hangover could come, although perhaps not immediately. However, let us not race ahead. I only shared my immediate impression about the British elections, but we are talking about the opinion that there is a general wave of conservatism in the West. Let us try to answer the question: Is there really such a wave or not?

[Shishlin] Undoubtedly there is because, after all, the fact that there is an ultraright wing in power in the United States is indisputable. Thatcher's political character is also known. The political character of the current Japanese Administration -- although I am not now talking about the West, but the East -- is also well known. In the FRG, conservative circles also returned to power after a long break.

[Zhurkin] There is another tendency in West Europe which we should not forget. The elections in Italy showed that the conservatives were defeated, and if we recall the recent past, there were events in Spain and Greece, and elections in Sweden. There are struggles there.

[Shishlin] Yes, I absolutely agree with this. Moreover, the results of the elections in Italy are, of course, a crushing blow for the Christian Democratic Party. It is possible that it will form a cabinet there, but the gap between the first and second parties -- the second party in Italy is the Communist Party -- is now a total of 800,000 votes. That is the difference. Incidentally, at one time it was 3 million votes. This is a change. All the same, the fact remains that a certain move to the right did occur and unquestionably this move to the right is a definite political reality today. It is another matter -- and you, Valentin Sergeyevich, quite rightly express doubts -- about the feelings that will possess the resident of 10 Downing Street after a certain period of time.

[Zorin] I think one of the reasons for this, although perhaps today we will not go into researching them, but one of the reasons is the economy and the fact that certain social democratic and other governments which managed affairs before this or that election were not able to cope successfully with these economic problems. Therefore, this is a reaction by voters to economic difficulties.

[Shishlin] Valentin Sergeyevich, you know I believe -- while this is, of course, not the only reason for the rightist wave in a number of bourgeois states -- nevertheless the formation of the so-called middle class has had an effect. They declare that they are the objects of exploitation from two sides. On one hand, exploitation by the oligarchy, big business; on the other hand, they assert that they are exploited by the poorest classes and that they are compelled to give up their own money in the form of taxes in order to feed the poor.

[Zhurkin] Yes. There is even a slogan thrown about, particularly in the United States but also in certain West European countries, that in periods of economic upsurge society can be charitable and help the poor, but in periods of economic difficulties everyone should take care of himself and society should not engage in charity.

[Zorin] A number of political writers and observers assert that the same rightist wave that reveals itself in a number of capitalist countries is strengtheing the unity of these countries. That is, that formerly their differences were discussed, and they had great differences, but now this rightist wave has created a certain base, an objective foundation for growth and unity in the capitalist countries' camp. Vitaliy Vladimirovich, is this in fact the case?

## Capitalist 'Unity' Discussed

[Zhurkin] Valentin Sergeyevich, I believe that unity is too far-reaching a term, although this word is now uttered regularly in the West. However, I think we can talk about a certain drawing together [sblizheniye] of a number of developed capitalist countries. This drawing together has a rightist or conservative basis, not only an anti-Soviet one.

President Reagan said after the Williamsburg meeting that NATO has never been as united as now. I must say that U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, a conservative magazine, immediately hurried to warn or even correct the President by saying in an article that there are very few political analysts who agree with such an assessment. The magazine said that this drawing together is fragile and has a fragile basis, and listed both the political and economic factors that counteract this.

I would like to say a few words about the economic factors. Something like an economic balance between the United States and West Europe has arisen within the Western alliance. Indeed, West Europe has produced more industrial products than the United States for a number of years now, something in the area of $700 billion at current prices. West European direct capital investments are the same as the United States for the first time in the postwar period. However, if one counts reciprocal capital investments, then the Americans have more. The United States has about $100 billion worth of capital investments in West Europe and the Europeans have $50 billion [in the United States] which is also an unprecedented figure and is growing quickly.

Regarding exports, West European exports today exceed U.S. exports by almost four times. This next detail is interesting and worth mentioning. If we count the gross social product per capita then it will show that the United States is falling behind the 10 capitalist West European countries. This serves as an economic basis for various economic wars, namely steel wars, agricultural wars, textile wars...

[Shishlin -- interrupting] Fishing wars.

[Zhurkin] Fishing wars. In some places this fabric, the fabric of the West's economic base, is mended, and in some places it is constantly and frequently torn. Thus, there is an economic base that is not firm.

Therefore, proceeding from this we pose the question: Is this drawing together on a conservative ideological basis short- or long-term? I would say that there is good reason for saying that this drawing together is short-term.

[Shishlin] Generally, when one speaks about unity existing and strengthening -- this is the most popular topic now in the West -- then doubts automatically arise whether this is so, that is, is there not more desire here than reality. Of course, after Williamsburg and after the NATO session in Paris, the United States to some extent brought its partners into line and also drew Japan closer to its plans. Incidentally -- I apologize for digressing -- the United States is paying great attention to the Asian zone, to the whole Far East region and the Pacific basin. At the moment, Secretary of State Shultz is on a 12-day trip to four Asian countries, and a trip to South Korea, Japan, and Indonesia by President Reagan is projected for the fall. This interest is not an accident. The United States is making military preparations in Asia and our television viewers are probably familiar with certain facts in this regard.

[Zhurkin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, I think that in this regard it is worth recalling such an important document as the joint statement of the Moscow meeting. It frankly states that in various regions of the world the existing hotbeds of military danger and crisis situations are becoming even more complicated and new ones are being created as a result of this imperialist policy of strength and diktat. The danger of their expansion is growing, undeclared wars are waged against a number of independent states, and a foreign military presence, which is alien to their national interests, is implanted. These are the words of a serious and strict warning, as you said at the beginning of our talk.

[Shishlin] This is so. This is unquestionably so because if one looks at it this way -- is there unity in the West regarding so-called Euroweapons -- it seems that on the surface there is. However, in fact, the Europeans, including official circles, are hesitating at the prospects accompanying the plan for NATO rearmament.

[Zhurkin] The United States is, of course, very actively pressuring West Europe. Take Vice President Bush. He was in Europe in February and is now traveling around Europe. The two basic aims of his visit have been officially announced: The first is to convince West Europeans that there is still a need to deploy U.S. intermediate-range missiles in West Europe. The other is to convince West Europeans about U.S. policies in Central America, another crisis area, and to urge their support for these policies. Moreover, Bush said before his departure that the differences between the United States and West Europe on this subject are particularly great.

Consider a crisis region such as the Middle East, where one crisis after another arises. After the Israeli aggression, which began last year and has not ceased to this day, one crisis after another breaks out.

[Zorin] Insofar as we have touched on the situation in the Middle East, I would like to concentrate our television viewers' attention, albeit briefly, on such a generally unhappy fact as the split which has occurred in the Palestinian movement. Our television viewers are familiar with reports on this subject from the press. I would like you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, to briefly discuss this.

[Shishlin] With one small condition. I would like for just a moment before trying to answer your question to say a few words about the fundamental topic of unity. In talking about the unity of the West, we must also put it in perspective and compare it to such a major question as the so-called East-West economic relations.

It is quite obvious that there is no unity here.

## Mideast Situation

There is also no unity in the approach to regional problems and no unity in the assessment of the situation that is taking place now in the Middle East, and there is no identical attitude toward what is happening today in the PLO, or more accurately in Fatah, a PLO organization. A number of Palestinian organizations are included in the PLO and Fatah is one of the most influential and one of the largest military organizations.

There were disagreements within the PLO before, but now perhaps these disagreements are being manifested particularly acutely and particularly dramatically. Unfortunately, one has to state that it seems that many Arab countries are to various extents in one way or another included in these disagreements within the PLO. The conflicting sides are bringing accusations against each other, at times fantastic ones.

In my personal opinion, for the reason for these quarrels and arguments, which have even developed into military conflicts within Fatah, one should look at last summer when Israel began military aggression in Lebanon. The results of this aggression intensified the struggle of views within the PLO on what to do next. The answer to this question is self-evident. That is, they must consolidate themselves, strengthen the alliance of all Arab forces, not allow the aggressor to rout the Arabs individually, and from a position of unity, that is, a strong position, defend their legal rights and strive for a comprehensive, just political settlement in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, something different is occurring now. Even the attitudes of various Arab states to the Lebanese-Israeli agreement is not the same. Individual Arab states like Syria and Libya resolutely reject this agreement. Others passively oppose it, while still others consider that this Lebanese-Israeli agreement should be accpeted. This conflict of opinions is, of course, particularly astutely manifested within the PLO. As our television viewers know, the matter has gone as far as Syria's declaring Yasir 'Arafat persona non grata.

At present this conflict is totally negative for the Palestinians and totally negative for the Arab nation. Arguments about tactics and forms of struggle are natural to a certain extent. However, no form of struggle will yield results if there is no unity. The fact that in both Damascus and within PLO circles they recently have started talking intensively about the necessity for democratic dialogue, a democratic solution to the conflict and overcoming differences, should be welcomed. It is simply a vital necessity for the just cause of the Arabs.

## European Problems

[Zorin] Returning to the problems of Europe, problems to which we are paying primary attention today, I would like to say that it is of course quite obvious that the path to improving the situation in Europe is complex, as the events of the very important year 1983 have shown. This process has many obstacles and it is proceeding with much difficulty.

However, there is another side to the matter. You know that one can always take a glass and say it is either half empty or half full. Well, from the point of view of the optimist it is half full, but from the point of view of the pessimist it is, without fail, half empty. If we talk about the position in Europe we see all the negative sides and difficulties of the process that is now occurring in Europe. On the other hand, we must state that, after all, a positive process is proceeding -- with difficulty, but proceeding.

Take this example: In a few days Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl is arriving in our country. It is an important visit. Well, it is no secret that the positions of the current Bonn leadership and the Soviet Union diverge on very many, and far from secondary, important questions. However, there is also the other side. The FRG is our country's number one trading partner among capitalist countries. Despite very strong pressure from Washington, Bonn has not curtailed economic ties. The very fact of such a visit itself is also an important political statement.

I also think that the Madrid meeting, the talks being held in Madrid by the Helsinki Accord member-states, may be a unique barometer of the political climate in Europe. I have to say that these talks have been going on for a very long time and soon it will be their third anniversary.

[Shishlin] They began on 11 November 1980.

[Zorin] Yes. The talks have dragged on for more than 2 and 1/2 years. Nikolay Vladimirovich, here I would like to pose perhaps a slightly blunt question, but I (?would like) to pose it. Do you personally believe that these drawn out talks in Madrid could end fruitfully?

[Shishlin] I think that one could answer this question in the affirmative. Unquestionably so. First, because...if only because the Moscow statement discusses the necessity for a successful end to the Madrid meeting, and the socialist countries which were represented in Moscow are participants at Madrid, and their statement itself is sufficiently weighty in this regard also.

On the other hand, we know that recently there was a document, a statement, or as it is also called, the conclusions of the European Community Council. It is also said there that the European group of 10 is prepared, thoughtfully and without prejudice, to consider the current situation at the Madrid meeting, particularly the initiative of 17 June advanced by the president of the Spanish Government Felipe Gonzalez. The essence of this initiative consists in the following: This situation has existed from the beginning and it still remains so, at least for the present. The last draft of the neutral and nonaligned countries included positions which could have been disputed from our viewpoint, and at the same time certain very important considerations, which we are convinced are necessary, were absent from the draft. However, in the interest of reaching agreement, the Soviet Union accepted the whole draft, and there was a corresponding personal appeal, an official appeal, by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to the meeting's participants to accept -- for agreement's sake -- the whole draft.

However, the United States, and those who turned out to be fellow travellers of the United States, began adding to the last draft of the neutral and nonaligned countries all sorts of new considerations obviously unacceptable to our country and to a number of socialist states. So, the meeting reached an impasse for the umpteenth time during these 2 and 1/2 years. However, now with this initiative by the head of the Spanish Government Felipe Gonzalez, judging by the Moscow statement and the reaction that exists in Western countries, it looks as though this could create conditions for a result. The most important thing is, of course, that generally there is a need for the Europeans themselves not to permit the withering of the overall European process.

[Zorin] Here I would like add this thought to what you have already said: We have already discussed the campaign of smiles in the United States. As everyone knows, naturally the main obstacle to the satisfactory end to the talks in Madrid is the position of the U.S. delegation. When now in Washington they talk a lot about flexibility which we have already discussed today, then it cannot but be reflected in Madrid.

It is not very easy to talk about flexibility and to continue to drive and demonstrate an extremely inflexible line in front of everybody and against one's allies in Europe. There are many reasons behind this so-called flexibility and we have discussed some of them: There are external reasons, relations with allies, and there are internal reasons. After all, the electoral campaign is approaching. In fact, it has already begun in the United States and it is probably not very advantageous to the current President to appear before voters with the stigma that the Democrats are trying to label him with. You know, it is no accident that Reagan's political opponents are already trying to conduct the campaign with talk about Reagan's being a warmonger. This is being said by U.S. bourgeois politicians. Plus the scandals that are now developing in the White House. Our television viewers know that a scandal reminiscent of Watergate has begun. It is difficult to say how it will end. The theft of documents from Carter's personal dossiers and their transfer to Reagan during the previous electoral campaign was discovered. At first the White House administration tried to brush it aside, but the Democrats are not allowing them to brush it aside. It is difficult to say how all this will end.

[Shishlin] Reagan, in the latest full-scale press conference which he holds from time to time, was obliged to hear out endless questions on this, but he declared, generally, that he was not familiar with these documents, that he did not use them, and he generally very often passes on papers without reading them, if he knows that these papers can be passed on to someone.

[Zhurkin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, if we recall the beginning of Watergate, it is very similar similar to that.

[Zorin] It is similar. There, too, Nixon said that he did not have the foggiest idea.

East-West Relations

[Zorin] I would like at the conclusion of our talk--since our time is coming to an end--to ask you, my colleagues, the following question: At the beginning of this year here in Studio 9 we said many times that 1983 was an extremely special year for international relations, a year in which much depends on the events which could take place. These events will exert a great influence on the course of the political process for quite a long time to come. Our talk is taking place when the first half of the year is already behind us. Therefore, I would like to ask you what you think the second half of this very important year has in store for us.

[Zhurkin] Primarily it depends on whom you are speaking about. President Reagan is probably dying for a way to rid himself of this nightmare, that is, the possible new Watergate. As for the world economic situation, the capitalist countries, that is, the United States and a number of West European countries, have begun a very difficult and erratic process of extricating themselves from the latest exceptionally and unusually difficult economic crisis. There are still a lot of questions but we are of course primarily considering the question of international politics, not the internal ones. What are we to expect in this respect? It seems to me that the second half of this year will also be complicated and difficult. On the one hand, we are faced with the threat of the beginning of the deployment of the U.S. intermediate-range missiles.

It was quite firmly stated in the joint Moscow statement that the socialist countries will not allow anyone to attain military superiority over them. The period of imperialism's military superiority over socialism has sunk into oblivion. It disappeared in the beginning of the 1970's and there will be no return to it.

[Shishlin] The balance in the second half of the year will not be destroyed. The same goes for future years because the determination of the Soviet Union and its friends not to permit the West to achieve military superiority and their determination to maintain the balance -- we want nothing more -- is unshakable. But if we think about what will mark the second half of the year, and how it will be marked, I think that it is indisputable that it will be marked by an intensification of the dialogue of countries with different social systems. I mean not only the concrete diplomatic calendar, which includes the visit of the West German chancellor to the USSR and the planned contacts with France, Spain, and other European states by our country and by our socialist allies, but also the substance of this dialogue. First of all, of course, there is the key topical problem of disarmament which, as is known, has been discussed at the Geneva talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms, at the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe as well as at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces in the central Europe.

The Soviet Union has enough patience, good will, persistence, and principle to search for a mutually acceptable solution at these talks. This was in fact confirmed in the first half of the year. We are also confident that this Soviet line, the line which is shared by our friends in the Warsaw Treaty, will be continued in the second half of the year. It also seems to me that it is by no means politically painless for the current Washington administration just to turn its back on the constructive line of the socialist states. No, both Americans and the U.S. leaders will have to think not about verbal flexibility but about genuine flexibility in the approach to the so-called disarmament problems.

I do not want at all to say that success is guaranteed at the talks in the next half of the year. No, success is not guaranteed. However, it seems to me that such calculated pessimism regarding the fate of the talks which prevails today in Western evaluations is a lot worse, a lot worse, then the willingness to patiently and persistently search for a balanced compromise.

I do not doubt, of course, that many complex problems which the world was facing in the first half year of 1983 will remain. Many complex problems will, of course, remain. But probably the lesson also will remain with us -- the lesson for Europe, the lesson for all -- that solutions by force are not only imperfect but that these solutions, as is demonstrated by the actions of the U.S. administration in Central America and in the Middle East, do not eliminate problems. They make these problems more complex. They add more bitterness to these problems, more horror, and raise additional complications on the path to a just solution of these problems.

Another thing. It seems indisputable to me that the second half of 1983 will be marked by close interaction of the socialist countries and by their active efforts to normalize the world political situation. The socialist countries indeed advocate the firm establishment of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. I think that even in this difficult year of 1983, during this difficult half year, there was a lot that proved that the spirit of detente is alove. I would like to recall the recent statement by Yuriy Valdimirovich Andropov at the party Central Committee plenum. He said: Our aim is not only to avert wars; we are striving for the fundamental normalization of international relations and the strengthening and development of all good initiatives in these relations. The efforts of our country, as a matter of fact, are directed at the achievement of this aim, the efforts which are shared today -- we say this very responsibly -- by our socialist friends, the efforts in which we will encounter ever grater understanding not only from the world progressive community but also, I think, from responsible political circles. As a matter of fact, the need for detente today is much more acute than ever before. In this regard, no matter how complicated the tasks are, the participants in the political battles of the 1980's are capable of solving these problems in the interests of peace, the peoples' tranquility and well being.

[Zorin] Our time on the air has ended. It remains for me to thank you, colleagues, for your participation in our talk, our television viewers for their attention, and until the next meeting here in Studio 9, thank you.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD012045 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 1 Jul 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by All-Union Radio Foreign Political Commentator Yevgeniy Kachanov with international affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev, and Igor Belyayev, doctor of economics and chairman of the Anti-Zionist Committee]

[Excerpts] [Kachanov] Our program is continuing to receive a large number of letters from people who voice serious concern over the dangerous development of events in the world and the aggravation of the situation brought about by Western, and above all, U.S. imperialist policies. From among a wide range of questions on disarmament, Soviet-American relations and so on I would like to single out those connected with the Soviet Union's latest peace initiatives. Here it is of course relevant to return to materials from the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and this week's Moscow meeting of leaders of seven socialist countries in Europe. We showed your letters, comrades, to international affairs journalist Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev. Please go ahead, Eduard Vasilyevich:

Latest Peace Initiatives

[Kovalev] In replying to the listeners' letters, Yevgeniy Viktorovich, what needs to be noted above all is that the joint statement from those who took part in the Moscow meeting of leading party and state figures from seven socialist countries in Europe, is today at the center of world attention. Listeners will of course already be familiar with the fundamental reactions to the joint statement by the participants in the Moscow meeting. I will not dwell on this, but instead I will cite just a few of the things that have been said in order to bring out the basic ideas, the basic trends contained in world media reactions.

In an editorial article the Bulgarian paper RABOTNICHESKO DELO wrote: From Moscow there has sounded forth clearly and categorically a voice witnessing determination to strengthen and defend peace. The socialist states of Europe have once again demonstrated a constructive approach to disarmament questions, readiness to cooperate and seek ways of curbing the arms race, and to seek mutually-acceptable solutions corresponding to the principle of equality and identical security. The participants in the Moscow meeting devoted special attention to the dangerous aggravation of the international situation resulting from the striving of the United States and some of its allies to attain military superiority over the socialist community. The socialist countries resolutely debunk the bogus thesis that a buildup of military might by the West can serve the interests of peace and security of the peoples. As is apparent, in the present acute international situation we demonstrate firmness and calm, unwavering consistency in the struggle for peace, and the certainty that war can be averted.

[Kachanov] Eduard Vasilyevich, the attention which the whole world has been giving to the reports from Moscow in understandable and natural. In this connection I should like to go back a few days to when Moscow was the venue for, first, the CPSU Central Committee plenum and then the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is understandable that the further development of the world situation to a large extent depends on our assessments of the present international situation on the positions and plans of the Soviet Union.

[Kovalev] The results of the plenum and of the Supreme Soviet session reflected the Soviet people's unanimity in support of the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state. They pointed to the Soviet people's desire to ensure the further advance of our homeland along the road of economic, scientific, and cultural development and of raising the level of the people's well-being. They also show that the Soviet people are fully ready to do everything necessary to strengthen peaceful conditions for creative labor both in our country and in the socialist countries of our allies. At this level, as we see it, the higher interests of the Soviet people wholly and totally coincide with the interests of the peoples of the world, of the whole of mankind.

The West must ultimately understand that all the intentions of the Soviet people and leadership come down to a simple and natural desire to engage in peaceful labor, to live in good accord with other peoples, and to find a common language with them, above all, in the cause of curbing the arms race, averting another war, and strengthening universal peace and international security. This has been repeatedly mentioned in the speeches by Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. Specifically, in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum Yuriy Vladimirovich said: An unprecedented sharpening of the struggle between the two world social systems has taken place. Yet at the same time an attempt to resolve the historical dispute between these systems through military engagement would be fatal for mankind. The nature of the further development of relations between them, that is, in essence, the question of preserving peace on earth, is today and for the foreseeable future the pivotal problem in our party's foreign policy.

Noting that peaceful coexistence is objectively facilitated by the military-strategic balance which has come about between socialism and imperialism, Yuriy Vladimirovich stressed: Our goal is not simply to avert wars; we are striving for a basic improvement in international relations and for the consolidation and development of all well-intentioned initiatives in these relations. We shall be striving to obtain respect for the sovereign rights of states and people, for strict observance of the principles of international law, which imperialism is trying ever more frequently to discard and trample.

[Kachanov] But, Eduard Vasilyevich, this is indeed one trend, one direction in the development of international relations. But there is another trend too, another direction in world politics. This was discussed, in particular, by Comrade Gromyko in his report at the Supreme Soviet session.

[Kovalev] He emphasized on that occasion, that the course of international events is determined -- to single out the chief factor -- by the antagonism between two lines: one toward preserving and strengthening peace; the other, the opposite one, toward undermining the foundations of peace. An analysis of facts and events in international life in recent weeks permits a quite definite conclusion to be drawn, a conclusion which shows in a clearcut way where the source of international tension lies. What I mean is that the line taken by the USSR and other socialist countries for peace and for safeguarding international security is opposed by the policies of the aggressive imperialist forces, above all those of Washington. These policies of theirs are the source of the present serious aggravation of the international situation. Those inspiring these policies are pouring forth a stream of slander in an attempt to prove that the threat to peace supposedly proceeds from the Soviet Union and that the West, as they put it, is merely reacting to this challenge.

Washington has long made heavy use in its armory of deceiving people regarding the United States' foreign policy line and Soviet foreign policy. They talk, for instance, indeed there is much talk, of a Soviet military superiority, at a time when there exists an approximate equality of forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The Soviet Union is in favor of taking this equality as a starting point for proceeding along the path of limiting and reducing armament in such a way as to maintain the balance at any given moment, although at ever lower levels. In Washington, however, they think not in terms of equality, but of superiority, and not about what is imagined to exist on the Soviet side, but about what really exists on the American side. There, they are banking on changing the strategic correlation of forces in their own favor. In this lies the fundamental aim of the United States' present policies in international affairs. It is for the sake of this aim, that they have been pressing ahead with a program to build up all types of weapons; above all nuclear ones. And they are not just arming themselves. They are urging their allies to do likewise and calling on them to make even more increases in military budgets. In order to undermine the strategic parity existing at the present time, they are determined at all costs to haul new nuclear weapons into West Europe and station them there.

Just listen to what the Western World Bulletin -- which is close to NATO -- was told a few days ago by a high-ranking official in the apparatus of the North Atlantic bloc. He said: in Britain, Italy and West German, NATO is already deploying new medium-range nuclear missiles. This deployment at present concerns 16 cruise missiles near Greenham Common in Britain, 16 cruise missiles at Comiso in Sicily, and 9 Pershing II missiles in West Germany. He goes on to say: As far as these missiles in particular are concerned, events in December will merely mean the completion of deployment. He also said that the whole of this general process reminded him of the way a prefabricated factory is built. The building of the whole installation is completely finished, so that the new owner can simply turn the key to the door, walk in and begin work. That is just how this prefabricated factory of death is being built. It is being done behind talk of negotiations.

So what is to be said about this? As U.S. Secretary of State Shultz stated frankly a few days ago, we, that is, the Americans, should not count on an agreement being reached in the near future at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. We, said Shultz, should base ourselves on strength. That is why the American side is proposing to the Soviet Union unacceptable unilateral disarmament.

It also needs to be said that the interests of its own security and that of its allies oblige the USSR to adopt, as the Soviet Government warned in its statement of 28 May this year, measures in response to strengthen its own defense capability. However, these are measures forced upon us, their sole purpose being not to permit any disturbance of the balance of forces which has come about. This was also referred to, incidentally, by the participants in the Moscow meeting, who consider that the situation emerging confronts all states and peoples with the issue of how to avert further dangerous developments and avert the world's drift toward nuclear catastrophe. The participants in the meeting, says the joint statement, see as the key issue of our time the earliest possible halting of the arms race and the transition to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. They consider it essential that everything be done for these urgent aims to be implemented, and they reaffirm their readiness to bend all their efforts to the solution of the issues through talks.

## Anti-Zionist Committee

[Kachanov] A listener from Penza Oblast writes: On the initiative of public organizations an Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public was set up in our country. I would like to know what practical tasks this committee is facing both inside our country and in the internation al arena. Here is a letter from Konotop: I have learned that an Anti-Zionist organization has been formed in the Soviet Union. My request is that you tell me about it in greater detail, in particular about its aims, charter, who can join it, and whether branches will be opened in other towns. Your questions, comrades, are answered by Doctor of Economics Igor Petrovich Belyayev, a permanent participant in our broadcast. He is deputy chairman of the Anti-Zionist Committee. If you please, Igor Petrovich.

[Belyayev] First of all, about the events which preceded the setting up of this public organization. On 1 April 1983 a group of prominent Soviet public figures -- among whom were scientists, social scientists, and representatives of the exact sciences, prominent figures in art, and also Twice Hero of the Soviet Union Colonel General Dragunskiy, one of the veterans in the struggle against international Zionism -- made an appeal.

In the appeal this group called for the creation of an anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public. On 21 April this committee started, so to speak, its activity. At the constituent assembly of this committee representatives of the public of the city of Moscow decided not only to set up the committee itself and elect its members, but also voted for the composition of the presidium of the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet public and for the leadership of this committee. Twice Hero of the Soviet Union Colonel General Dragunskiy was elected chairman of the committee. Professor Doctor of Juridical Sciences Zivs, a prominent Soviet lawyer, was elected first deputy chairman. Deputy chairmen were also elected. And so, essentially in the past month the Anti-Zionist Committee started its practical work.

[Kachanov] One needs to add that the composition of the committee is international. In it are representatives from many peoples of our country. But, Igor Petrovich, how does one, nevertheless, explain the appearance of one more Soviet public organization: the Anti-Zionist Committee?

[Belyayev] First of all, the necessity to fight the crusade being waged against the Soviet Union and world socialism which is already known to the Soviet people. As a result of the actions of the United States the threat to peace on earth has grown and this is arousing profound alarm among all honest people. In its global strategy imperialism is making a wide use of international Zionism back at the start of the activity of our party. His speeches against the Bund, against attempts by the representatives of this organization to blast the unity of the party, to blast the unity of the workers' movement in prerevolutionary Russia, are known to every one.

Now when the attempts by international Zionism to blast national unity inside the Soviet Union, to defame its foreign policy are perfectly obvious, some efforts aimed at waging the struggle against this adversary in a more purposeful way are, of course, necessary. And, consequently, the Anti-Soviet Committee of the Soviet public, will now concentrate its efforts on the struggle against subversive actions by various kinds of Zionist centers and all those who are attempting to undermine the national unity of the peoples of our country and thus weaken our state in the face of the growth of international tension and of the danger of a new world war.

[Kachanov] Igor Petrovich, what can be said about the organizational structure of the Anti-Zionist committee? How is it, so to speak organized?

[Belyayev] There is a charter of the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet public. It was approved at the very same assembly of representatives of the Moscow public which took place on 21 April 1983. The charter's article one says: The Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet public has been set up to pool the efforts of Soviet citizens in an organized rebuff to Zionism, in unmasking its reactionary ideology and political practice.

Hardly had the report on the setting up of the Anti-Zionist Committee reached the mass media in the West when the representatives of some of them stated that the appearance of such a committee is almost a manifestation of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. This attack can be answered with only one consideration.

It consists of the following: Hardly does someone in the Soviet Union and in other countries raise his voice in defense of the victims of Israeli aggression or comes out against Zionism than he is immediately accused of anti-Semitism, while at the same time our Marxist approach both to Zionism and anti-Semitism is such that we believe that the struggle against all kinds of chauvinist and nationalist quirks is our task. We will fight both against Zionism and its intrigues, inside and outside the Soviet Union, and against anti-Semitism as a phenomenon which disturbs the fabric of national relations inside our country. And, by the way, during Israel's war in Lebanon very many observers, correspondents of the Western news media who were in Beirut and in other regions of Lebanon wrote about those brutalities which were brought down on this small Arab country. They were also accused of anti-Semitism.

[Belyayev continues] But what about this: I recently visited Israel with a Soviet delegation. There we were told of how great the scale of the antiwar struggle is in this country, in Israel itself. We were, for instance, on the square where last September a very powerful demonstration attended by 400,000 Israelis took place against brutality in Lebanon, against the war in Lebanon and against war in other Arab countries. If in this regard the question is asked: Is this then a manifestation of anti-Semitism? Of course not. Simply, those who claim such a thing are speculating on the natural feeling of protest against anti-Semitism and are attempting by linking anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism virtually to emasculate the essence of that struggle which all opponents of Zionism are waging throughout the world.

Article two of our committee's charter says: The Anti-Soviet Committee of the Soviet public is an all-union public organization, operating in accordance with Article 51 of the USSR Constitution and on the basis of the present charter.

Some observers, some politicians, and political scientists put the question as follows: Does the Anti-Zionist Committee have a mandate in the Soviet Union? I would like to answer this question: Yes, a mandate has been given to the Anti-Zionist committee by the Soviet public. First of all, I would like to refer to letters which have reached the Anti-Zionist Committee. I will read out only excerpts from one letter. Here it is: When I and all my fellow villagers read in PRAVDA the appeal by the initiating group on setting up the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public, each one of us expressed the wish to take an active part in its work. We regard it as our duty to fight in every way against the intrigues of the leaders of international Zionism who are with all their might trying to slander the life of Jews in Soviet society. These are not new intrigues. They have already more than once received a rebuff and will also receive it now again. Only political adventurists can slander reality and defame our gains. Fighting them is our duty.

There are thousands of such letters and perhaps also tens of thousands since they come from the most varied organizations of the Soviet Union. The appearance of this stream of letters, as well as the oral statements by the representatives of our intelligentsia, our scientists, and representatives of public organizations, are evidence that the Anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public has received a mandate for its activity from the Soviet people.

Article 3 of the charter says: By its entire activity the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet public is giving assistance in the conduct of the Leninist nationalities policy, in strengthening the friendship of the nationalities and ethnic groups of the Soviet multinational state.

I would like to stress that this is the main thought which permeates the entire work of the Anti-Zionist Committee.

Now I will answer another question: Where will funds for the Anti-Zionist Committee come from? First of all from the assignments of subsidies from Soviet public organizations; from voluntary payments by various organizations -- scientific, artistic and cultural and educational institutions and associations; and also from the payments of individual citizens and the revenues of publishing activity.

[Kachanov] Thank you.

MOSCOW SUMMIT, U.S. CONDUCT CONTRASTED

PM012042 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[P. Vladimirskiy Article: "A Fusion of Realism and Responsibility"]

[Text] At a time when the world public is continuing to discuss the materials of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet session, a meeting has been held in Moscow of leading party and state figures form Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR. After jointly analyzing the situation prevailing in Europe and the world as a whole, the meeting participants expressed concern on behalf of their socialist states at the continuing buildup of tension, the further destabilization of interstate relations, and the increase in the threat of nuclear war.

The meeting confirmed the assessments and conclusions regarding the international situation contained in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee Conference in Prague. At the same time, the broad peace-loving program put forward in Prague is receiving further development. The joint statement issued by the participants in the Moscow meeting contains a whole range of important initiatives aimed at the peaceful solution of vital international problems.

The text of the joint statement adopted in Moscow is being actively discussed and broadly commented on by the Western press and is undoubtedly being attentively analyzed in government offices in Western capitals. The first responses are already showing that the socialist community states' peace-loving efforts are in accord with the aspirations of millions of people in the world and are meeting with their approval and support.

What is the attraction of the foreign policy initiatives of the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries? It lies in the spirit of realism and responsibility that pervades their proposals and in the correspondence between those proposals and the objective requirements of the development of international relations and the peace-loving aspirations of the peoples.

There is also much talk of realism and responsibility in Washington. However, it is not enough just to call one's policy sober and balanced, it must also be given adequate content. Washington's pretensions to realism and responsibility are as far from the real content of those concepts as granting the MX missiles the publicity and propaganda title "peacekeeper" is from the maintenance of peace. Those who determine U.S. foreign policy are presenting the world as it seems to them for the world as it really is and are looking at the present complex situation with an inexcusable lack of seriousness or, as one West German weekly remarked, through the "prism of anecdotes." And it is by no means in keeping with realism and responsibility in international affairs to identify those qualities with a striving for superior military force, with the profession of doctrines and concepts which permit the possibility and even the expediency of nuclear war, and with attempts to subordinate the further course of history to the interests of U.S. imperialism. That is not simply an unrealistic and irresponsible policy.

In our nuclear space age, it is a reckless policy capable of developing into a tragedy whose horrors no people will be spared.

In the socialist community states' approach, realism and responsibility act as a single organic whole which gives a constructive and specific character to their proposals. Their realism and responsibility are shown primarily in the assessment of the prevailing international situation. The participants in the Moscow meeting realize that, under present conditions, when states possess weapons capable of transforming our planet into a lifeless desert, the threat of nuclear war which was successfully and perceptibly rolled back in the seventies has begun to increase again, and international tension has reached dangerous limits. At the same time, they are convinced of the possibility of stopping the nuclear madness. The basis for eliminating the danger of nuclear catastrophe exists. That basis is the equality of forces between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO, which could become an even more reliable guarantee of international stability were the level of military confrontation to be lowered, as the socialist countries propose.

Acting with an awareness of their historical responsibility for the fate of peace, the USSR and its allies are also proposing specific paths for reviving detente in international relations.

"Our aim," Yu.V. Andropov stated at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, "is not simply to avert war. We are striving for a radical improvement of international relations and the consolidation and development of all the good principles in those relations."

Concern for peace is an invariable constant of Soviet foreign policy. As was noted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, an orientation toward the consistent and unceasing struggle for peace has been the soul of Soviet foreign policy since Lenin's Decree on Peace.

The participants in the Moscow meeting, their joint statement says, "are firmly convinced that no world problems, including the historical dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved by military means."

Some Western leaders who speak of realism and responsibility sometimes also call for "restraint" in international relations, although there too they do not back up their statements with concrete deeds. American-style "restraint" means, in fact, merely the creation of favorable external conditions for U.S. interference in other countries' internal affairs.

It is indicative that the statements in question are accompanied by cynical demands for the "evolution of the Soviet system and the socialist order" in a direction that suits Washington. Nor is the concept of restraint compatible with the artificial kindling of antagonisms, the use of various unscrupulous propaganda methods, and the creation of an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion, which have become the norm for American conduct in international affairs. All this is clearly contrary to the concept of restraint enshrined in the Soviet-U.S. document "Basic Principles of Relations between the USSR and the United States" which was sealed at summit level.

Proceeding from the reality of the prevailing international situation, the USSR and its allies consider it necessary for genuine restraint to be shown in relations between all states.

The socialist community countries attach special significance to the demonstration of restraint in the arms sphere and in military policy. In practice, that means the maintenance of military equilibrium not at the present level but at a lower level. It is proposed that this aim be attained in stages by resolving each task in turn. That is also the aim of the concrete proposals on curbing the arms race put forward by the Soviet Union and all the participants in the meeting in Moscow.

Paramount significance in here would attach to freezing nuclear arsenals both quantitatively and qualitatively. Halting the further stockpiling of nuclear weapons is a comparatively easy step to carry out and at the same time a very effective step, creating favorable preconditions for holding talks on limiting nuclear arms, achieving subsequent reductions, and, ultimately, eliminating them. That measure can be compared to applying the emergency brake in a runaway express whose name is the nuclear arms race.

The USSR is demonstrating its readiness for restraint in the arms sphere at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe and on strategic arms limitation and reduction. Its proposals, built on the principle of equality and identical security, create a businesslike basis for arms race limitation in the most dangerous areas. The same realism and responsibility can also be observed in the socialist countries' new proposals at the Vienna talks on the limitation of armed forces and arms in central Europe, which open the way to simple and practical solutions.

And how else than as a show of restraint can one characterize the Soviet Union's unilateral commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons? If the other nuclear powers showed the same high sense of responsibility and followed our country's example, it would be tantamount to banning the use of nuclear weapons.

The attempts by Washington and its allies to cast doubt upon the historic significance of that Soviet action merely exposes their scheme, which is contrary to commonsense, of having their hands free to unleash nuclear war. After all, if you take at face value America's "concern" at the mythical threat of attack by means of conventional weapons there is nothing to explain the stubborn refusal of the United States and NATO to sit down to talks with the Warsaw Pact countries and to discuss an agreement which would contain a reciprocal commitment not to be first to use any weapons -- either nuclear or conventional. It is clear that the present U.S. Administration is not interested in restraint in the sphere of arms limitation or military policy. It is obsessed by a desire to build up its military might.

U.S. statements in favor of dialogue cannot be considered realistic when they are accompanied by attempts to use the talks as a screen for building up their own arms to the detriment of the other side's security. it must be clear to those people at the helm of state policy that there is no rational alternative to seeking mutually acceptable solutions. For that it is necessary to hold honest talks and not to try to outwit one's partner by presenting deception as truth. Agreements at the arms limitation talks can only be reached on the principle of equality and identical security. That principle is consistently adhered to by the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Of course, realism and responsibility in international affairs presuppose the strict observance of previously assumed international commitments. That theme is also heard often in Washington. But it has a far-fetched and artificial ring and totally fails to tally with practical deeds. The U.S. refusal to hold talks on the full and universal banning of nuclear weapons tests is completely contrary to the commitments assumed under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. And can one really consider responsible the U.S. Administration's negative attitude toward the ratification of treaties which affect various aspects of arms race containment?

Finally, realism and a responsible attitude are incompatible with an absence in interstate affairs of the minimum degree of generally accepted propriety [korrektnost] and with Washington's waging of psychological warfare. It is sometimes said that one should not take seriously the high-flown rhetoric and bellicose official statements that are heard from across the ocean. There could be no argument with that were that rhetoric not directly reflected in U.S. policy, which is extremely dangerous by virtue of its adventurism.

Acting with an awareness of their historic responsibility for mankind's present and future, the Soviet Union and all the socialist community states proceed from the premise that ensuring firm, reliable and stable peace is not only a prime and imperative necessity, it is also a practical and urgent matter for all peace-loving states, all people of good will, and all peoples. There is not and cannot be any room for indifference, apathy, and passivity here.

The joint statement of the participants in the Moscow meeting expresses a readiness to pool their efforts with those of all countries, irrespective of their sociopolitical systems, and with all who advocate the strengthening of peace and international security with the aim of carrying out practical steps capable of preventing matters from deteriorating. That document is truly a fusion of realism and supreme responsibility for the fate of peace and of mankind.

U.S., PRC COMMENT ON RECENT MOSCOW SUMMIT

PM041326 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Key Question of the Present Day"]

[Excerpts] 30 Jun -- With utmost force the socialist states have confirmed their determination to do everything to resolve the key question of the present day -- how to end the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, as quickly as possible, how to improve the international situation, and how to preserve and consolidate peace in the world. Such was the keynote of the responses from the international public and the foreign mass media to the results of the Moscow meeting of socialist countries' leading party and state figures.

The participants in the Moscow meeting, China's RENMIN RIBAO states, accused the United States and its allies of conducting an unprecedented arms race and of pursuing military superiority. A joint statement adopted at the meeting stresses that the socialist states will not permit military superiority to be gained over them under any circumstances.

The American press continues to comment on the results of the Moscow meeting and the joint statement approved by its participants. As is clear from press reports, official Washington is reacting unfavorably to any initiative aimed at easing tension and curbing the arms race. That is also demonstrated by a statement by a U.S. State Department spokesman who, when broaching the meeting in Moscow, tried to distort the essence of the socialist countries' peace initiatives and the point of their appeal for an urgent nuclear arms freeze by all nuclear powers, primarily the USSR and the United States. He confirmed the U.S. "long-standing and well known position" on that question, in other words, he tried to justify the Reagan administration's course of fueling the arms race and destabilizing the situation in the world.

## SHULTZ ASSURES U.S. SUPPORT FOR INDIAN UNITY

### Greeted by Protests

PM011533 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "G. Shultz' Trip"]

[Text] Delhi, 30 Jun -- Talks are beginning here today between Indian External Affairs Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, who has arrived here on an official visit. In a short press statement at the airport, the U.S. secretary of state hastened to give assurances that the Reagan administration "supports India's unity and territorial integrity." That was necessary, the newspaper STATESMAN writes, to silence the critics of U.S. policy in India.

The press's recalling a recent statement by H. Barnes, U.S. ambassador to India, in which he actually confirmed that Washington supports the activity of the separatists striving to divide India. Such a statement shows, as Prime Minister I. Ghandi has stressed, that "certain outside forces are not interested in India's political stability." The Indian press is drawing attention to the fact that the U.S. secretary of state was greeted by protest demonstrations organized by various parties and organizations.

### Talks With Gandhi, Rao

LD011853 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] New Delhi July 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Baidashin reports: In covering yesterday's talks here between U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, the Indian press, including the newspapers INDIAN EXPRESS and PATRIOT, points out that the views of India and the USA on major international and political problems are vastly different and that differences on many problems persevere.

According to the press, Indira Gandhi told the U.S. state secretary that stability in India was important not only to the stability of the entire region but also to that of the world at large. Local observers view this statement of the Indian Government as a response to Washington's incessant intrigues against the national unity and territorial integrity of India, which is manifest in the support given by the U.S. secret services to the separatist groupings operating in Punjab and in the north-east of the country.

India also voiced concern over continued arms supplies to Pakistan, which create a direct threat to peace, security and stability in India and in the whole region. It was clear from the reply of the U.S. secretary of state that the Reagan administration intended to continue to meet Islamabad's requests for modern weaponry, thus spurring on another round of the arms race in the South Asian subcontinent.

As chairwoman of the Non-Aligned Movement, Indira Gandhi informed the U.S. secretary of state of the decisions of the 7th non-aligned summit which were prompted by concern for peace, for curbing the nuclear arms race and for removing the threat of nuclear war.

The Indian leaders voiced worry over U.S. reservations over the granting, of easy loans to India for development purposes by international financial institutions, controlled by U.S. capital. Washington's tough stand in this field is regarded by them as an attempt to punish New Delhi for its independent domestic and foreign policies.

Delivering a speech at a reception on the occasion of the visit of the U.S. state secretary, Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao said that India would continue to do everything possible to strengthen the Non-Aligned Movement and policy of peaceful coexistence and would not tolerate any intervention in the affairs of the region. There is relative stability in South Asia, the foreign minister said. This is no chance. India is making its contribution to the continuation of that stability by its foreign policy of peaceful coexistence, which is confirmed by its firm allegiance to the ideals of non-alignment.

According to the local press, Narasimha Rao disagreed with Washington's aggressive militarist course on the international scene. "We in India believe that it is impossible to resolve problems in the developing countries by violence or arms exports. Armed conflicts and peaceful development cannot coexist. India for her part advocates the peaceful development of relations of peace and good-neighbourliness with all the countries of the region."

## Shultz Press Conference

LD012149 Moscow TASS in English 2145 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Text] New Delhi July 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Baidashin reports:

A press conference of U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz was held here today upon the conclusion of the Indian-American talks. Shultz, specifically, admitted that differences on a number of bilateral and international issues remain between the two countries. As is known, India expresses concern over Washington's intention to turn India's neighbor Pakistan into Washington's gendarme in the region. For this purpose up-to-date U.S. armaments, including "F-16" fighter-bombers, capable of nuclear delivery, are being shipped to Islamabad. A concern of the Indian government is caused by the United States backing for the separatist groups in India. India, whose prime minister is chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, is also seeking Washington's consent for the holding of an international conference on financial affairs so as to change the structure of the existing relations in the sphere, relations that are discriminatory against developing states.

The U.S. secretary of state however made it plain at the press conference that the Reagan administration is not interested in any reforms in the financial relations. The United States sees in the legitimate demands of the overwhelming majority of the non-aligned states a threat to its diktat in international financial institutions of the West, specifically in the notorious International Monetary Fund which is zealously upholding the interests of monopolies, above all U.S. monopolies. We believe nothing should be done that might undermine the operation of the International Monetary Fund, Shultz said.

Local observers pointed out that the U.S. Secretary of State raised at the press conference the question of India's intention to purchase armaments from the USA. Saying casually that, however, no concrete proposal about the purchases of U.S. armaments came so far from India, Shultz, nevertheless dwelt at length on the fact that the United States is prepared to sell armaments to India.

As is known, the Indian government already rejected in the past the assertions made by officials from the U.S. Administration that India displays interest in purchasing armaments in the United States. The well-informed Indian newspaper TIMES OF INDIA recently write that such allegations made by State Department officials caused amazement in India's Defense Ministry. Local political observers believe that propaganda stratagems of this kind on the part of American officials have a dual purpose: to encourage young developing countries to military cooperation with Washington and dampen the criticism of the United States in connection with the large-scale American arms deliveries to Pakistan.

## To Balance Regional Strength

LD031509 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Commentary by Andrey Alov]

[Text] The visit to India by United States Secretary of State George Shultz has become another leg of his many-day tour of Asian countries. He visited Agra to enjoy the sight of the moonlit Taj Mahal, but his romantic mood was dispelled by the noise of a demonstration. The demonstrators were demanding that the United States renounce its plans to militarize the Indian Ocean and give up interference in India's internal affairs. Mr Shultz was a coauthor of the new strategy for Asia -- so-called -- which the Reagan administration had advanced. This strategy is based on a desire to ensure American military presence in Asia.

Without this presence, Mr Shultz himself assures, there will not be any peace and tranquillity in Asia. This goal determined the United States position in relations with each concrete Asian country. American benevolence is given to regimes which are susceptible to American strategic concepts. Washington is obviously giving priority in its foreign policy to countries that are ready to grant their territory for Pentagon bases, to enter into military partnership with it. This approach puts the United States in advance in the position of an opponent to those Asian countries that follow a nonaligned course.

Mr Shultz said meaningfully in the New Delhi, that what was good for India, was also good for the United States. Let us not quibble about the innermost meaning of how Mr Shultz understands the Indian interests. Instead, let us confine ourselves to what becomes apparent during the talks the United States secretary of state had in India. I will quote a report by the Asia News Agency which notes that differences were revealed at the Indo-American negotiations on such issues as the situation around Afghanistan, Kampuchea and the approach to problems of disarmament.

There is particular concern in India about the rather far-reaching flirtations between the United States and the Pakistani generals. The flirtation has now reached the stage of a dangerous deal. In exchange for massive supplies of the latest American arms, the United States is pressing for the creation of its bases on Pakistani territory. Islamabad's connivance with the requests from the United States has already brought about a situation when Pakistan has become a front-line state so to speak, the main stronghold for the undeclared war against Afghanistan. Today, other much bigger designs are being considered. Pakistan is viewed as the bulwark of the entire American strategic structure in the region. Relying on Pakistan, the Pentagon expects to turn the whole of Southwest Asia into its third strategic zone along with Western Europe and the Far East. In other words these are attempts to draw that region of Asia into the worldwide American strategy.

During his stay in India, George Shultz tried to justify the deployment of American strategic positions in the Indian Ocean by referring to a need to maintain some sort of balance of strength in the region. But the question is: What does the United States actually want to balance out in the area?

Mr Shultz himself made a direct mention of the Soviet Union, but this is an underhanded trick. It is well known that the Soviet Union is not going to compete with the United States in the arms race in the Indian Ocean area. It has no military bases there. The Soviet Union is not deploying any strategic naval force in the Indian Ocean. It does not threaten anyone. On the contrary, it supports the liberation struggle of peoples.

This is why one can say definitely that the buildup in the American military presence in Asia is aimed against the Asian countries themselves. The rise in the national liberation movement is what the United States would like to balance out, with its bases and its 5th Fleet being deployed in the Indian Ocean.

Statements by George Shultz during his visit to India give no ground for predicting any changes in Washington's line in Asia. Both in Southeast Asia and in the Persian Gulf area the United States banks on a hostile stand-off of some countries against others. Apparently, the Washington leaders assume that in this situation of confrontation the United States will find it easier to attain its objectives.

Departs; Differences Remain

LD021242 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Text] New Delhi July 2 TASS - U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz left Delhi for Islamabad today after a four-day official visit to India. Acting on a request from the U.S. Embassy, police surrounded the international airport Palam on three sides to bar possible demonstrators from approaching the air terminal. The security operation was not accidental. When Shultz arrived in Delhi on June 29, he was greeted with mass protest demonstrations at the airport and outside the U.S. Embassy. The demonstrators, representing various Indian political parties, voiced strong protests against U.S. interference in India's internal affairs and U.S. militarist policy in the region.

The U.S. secretary of state declined to make any statement for the press or answer questions from numerous Indian and foreign newsmen who had gathered at the airport. After his departure, journalists asked Indian Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao, who had seen him off, if there still remained differences in the U.S. and Indian approaches to various international issues. The Indian minister answered in the affirmative. The differences, he said, were most noticeable in the two countries' approaches to the policy of the movement of non-alignment and developments in the region as well as in the economic field.

SHULTZ PAKISTAN VISIT TO FOCUS ON AFGHANISTAN

Arrival in Pakistan

LD021050 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Text] Islamabad July 2 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived here from Delhi today for an official two-day visit.

In a brief statement at the Islamabad Airport, he declared that he was going to discuss with the Pakistani side a wide range of both international and bilateral issues, starting from strategic and ending with economic ones. Shultz also expressed the desire to hear from the Pakistani foreign minister about the results of the latest round of Geneva talks between Pakistan and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Special attention, according to Shultz, will be paid during the talks, to the situation around Afghanistan.

Pakistan 'Frontline State'

LD050053 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] The United States Secretary of State George Shultz has just completed a tour of southeastern and southern Asia. Our commentary, by Vladimir (Baturov), concerns the last 3 days of the tour.

State Secretary Shultz spent the last 3 days in Pakistan. Yet before his arrival, the Pakistani news media voiced the fear that Mr. Shultz would try to involve Pakistan still more deeply in the United States strategy of keeping Southwest Asia a seat of tension. Now we can see there was good reason for the fear. The state secretary emphasized during his visit, that the United States attached great strategic significance to Pakistan. He called Pakistan a frontline state and said the United States intended to help ensure its security. Indeed, the United States is very eager to obtain military bases in Pakistan and also the right to use the country's seaports and airports, and [word indistinct] heavy weaponry.

[words indistinct] United States to expect Pakistan to play an important role in the Central Command it has set up for a huge area, embracing the Middle East and extending eastwards to include the Indian Ocean. To get what it wants, the United States is ready to bludgeon Pakistan with the so-called Afghan problem. During Mr Shultz's visit, an American official, who agreed to speak to foreign newsmen provided he remained unidentified, made it perfectly clear that Pakistan will pay dearly if it agrees to a political arrangement with Afghanistan. According to an ASSOCIATED PRESS report from Islamabad, the American official said that if the Afghan problem was settled, Pakistan would immediately lose its priority status among recipients of American aid. Lately, the United States has provided Pakistan with 3.2 million dollars worth of military and other aid.

However, the United States has not confined itself to blackmail. On Sunday, Mr Shultz visited a camp of so-called Afghan refugees on the outskirts of Peshawar and made it clear the United States would continue to support the Afghan counterrevolutionaries in their armed attacks on the civilians in Afghanistan. In other words, the United States intends to continue its undeclared war on the legitimate Government of Afghanistan. That same day, in another provocative (?move) the U.S. secretary of state paid a visit to the strategic Khyber Pass, on the Afghan frontier, and surveyed Afghan territory from the viewing platform of the Pakistani border post.

Essentially, Secretary Shultz repeated the tour made 3 years ago by the then U.S. Secretary Zbigniew Brzezinski. We may assume he wished to underline the continuity of United States policy towards Afghanistan. But all these moves can only be seen as an attempt to upset the talks between Afghanistan and Pakistan, which the representative of the United Nations Secretary General, Diego Cordovez, is mediating. Indeed, Mr. Shultz made some remarks during his visit that showed that the United States is displeased with the course of the talks. He criticized the proposal made in Geneva that the United States should act as one of the guarantors of the possible settlement, saying it was untimely. And he claimed the Soviet position on the Afghan problem did not generate optimism.

It's well to remember the advice THE NEW YORK TIMES recently gave Washington, to see to it that Moscow and Kabul appeared responsible if the talks broke down. (?In short), Mr. Shultz' visit to Pakistan, and in fact his whole tour of Asia has done nothing to promote trust in international relations. If anything, (?the visit) has served to undermine trust.

## Backing for Afghan 'Bandits'

LD041638 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 4 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- TASS political observer Askold Biryukov writes: The visit to Pakistan by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz showed again how the present U.S. Administration views "the political settlement of the Afghan problem".

A France Presse correspondent reported that just after the arrival in Islamabad, Shultz told newsmen: We are for acceptable (?) settlement of the Afghan problem on the basis of American directives. Just like that: on the basis of American directives. No more, no less. But if the other side does not yield to such an American diktat? Then...under no circumstances will the United States agree to the settlement of the Afghan problem which will not be meeting these directives completely, said a close adviser to the secretary of state. Is this not a sample of Washington's arrogant, truly imperial approach to problems that are immediately related to the normalization of the international situation?

As WASHINGTON POST reported, Pakistan's foreign minister Yaqub Ali Khan said, for instance, that there is a "permanent, remarkable and substantial" progress at the talks in Geneva between Pakistan and Afghanistan that are held with the mediation of representative of the United Nations Secretary General Diego Cordovez. "Our impression," the minister said, "is that the Soviet Union has a serious attitude to this process of the quest of solution."

But according to Shultz, France Presse reports, the results of the latest sounds of the Geneva talks do not give particular reasons for optimism, just as the "Soviet Union's stand on the Afghan problem" does not lead to optimism, either. In general, the United States believes that the proposal that neither of the sides should interfere in the affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is "premature", the secretary of state said.

It should be recalled that special attention to the question of ending this interference was paid at the latest talks in Geneva, and, as Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Shah Mohammad Dost said, that round of talks can be viewed as another step forward.

And Shultz regards this step to be "premature". It is easy to see why. The progress that started showing at the talks does not go together with the course of the Reagan Administration at the intensification of the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the quantitative increase and qualitative enhancement of the military aid to the Afghan counter-revolutionaries with whose use this war is waged. It is not accidental, that during his visit to one of camps near Peshawar that serve as a lair for murderers and terrorists making raids on peaceful population of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Shultz told the bandits: We are on your side. It is not accidental that he promised them the continued "firm U.S. backing". And it is not accidental that when looking through field-glasses on the Afghan territory from one of Pakistani military posts he should interest as to what targets on Afghan land could be hit from that point.

According to a commentary of correspondent of ABC television company Dunsmore, George Shultz's visit to Pakistan had the aim to confirm the U.S. policy with regard to Afghanistan. What George Shultz confirmed, is that they in Washington do not want a genuine political settlement of a situation around Afghanistan. They, apparently, intend to oppose it in every way, to preserve a permanent seat of tension in the area, a pretext for interference in the affairs of countries of the region for the sake of achieving the goals of their imperial policy.

## FRG'S KOHL, GENSCHER IN MOSCOW ON OFFICIAL VISIT

### Visit Previewed

LD020232 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 1 Jul 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Edvard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl is being discussed in the West, particularly in West Germany, of course. It will be his first trip to our country as head of the government of the Federal Republic. On the eve of events of this sort, good things above all come to mind, of course, the positive things which have accumulated in relations between our two states over the past 10-13 years. It is no coincidence that I refer to these figures. I refer to them because these positive things above all owe their emergence and subsequent strengthening to the treaty between the USSR and the Federal Republic which was signed in Moscow 13 years ago, in August 1970. This historic document was, one might say, the point of departure in the process of improving the situation in Europe, in everything that we now call detente.

Political dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the FRG; contacts at all levels; and broad economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation -- all this has become our common possession. It is in the interests of both the FRG and our country. "Days of the Soviet Union" have just been held in West Germany with exceptional success while there have been visits to Moscow by (Christiansen), chairman of the board of Deutsche Bank, one of the biggest West German banks; Spaeth, premier of Baden-Wuerttemberg; and Lambsdorff, FRG minister of economic affairs.

We in the Soviet Union attach great significance to relations with the FRG. It is well-known that there are also considerable forces in the Federal Republic which are striving to prevent anyone from squandering what has been achieved. Rather they wish to preserve and expand it. But when you talk to FRG representatives and read that country's democratic press, you can also see signs of concern for the further destiny of Soviet-West German relations.

Are there grounds for this concern? Yes, there are. Many are saying that 1983 is a decisive one for the cause of European peace. It is no longer being concealed in Bonn, and even less so in Washington, that new U.S. nuclear-missile weapons will start arriving in West Germany at the end of the year. "The Pershings Are Coming", proclaims the cover of DER SPIEGEL magazine. It is no secret to anyone that they are coming to West German territory and it is no secret to anyone that if they come, this will destabilize in a most serious manner the situation in Europe, deal a blow to relations between the European states, and signify a fresh round in the nuclear-missile arms race.

We are naturally resolutely opposed to such a turn of events. As was declared by the parties at the meeting of the party and state leaders of the fraternal socialist countries which was held in Moscow, it is necessary to achieve at least an agreement which will rule out the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in the Western European countries and provide for a corresponding reduction in the medium-range weapons in existence in Europe with the purpose of ensuring an equilibrium at the lowest level.

But sentiments in Washington are quite different. Here is a picture which DER SPIEGEL has published of Weinberger. [Video shows still photo of Weinberger surrounded by models of weapons], the head of the U.S. Pentagon, who has recently been literally dashing to and fro between Washington and Bonn, doing his utmost to palm off his deadly goods.

U.S. Vice President Bush, who was also in the capital on the Rhine a few days ago, even brought with him a message from Reagan to Chancellor Kohl specially devoted to the Chancellor's visit to the Soviet Union. Bush said that the master of the White House has full confidence in Kohl at his forthcoming Moscow talks. I do not know what that is called in diplomatic language but a journalist would call such strange methods of dealing with the leader of a sovereign European state ill-concealed pressure, an attempt to keep an ally firmly on a short leash.

It goes without saying that there are a large number of differences between the Soviet Union and the FRG but our countries also have a broad community of interests. What is more, these are not short-term interests but long-term and even permanent interests. The peoples of the two countries are united above all by a desire to live in peace and in good-neighborliness. One should like to hope that the forthcoming Moscow talks which the West German chancellor is to have will contribute to this.

'An Important Event'

DW031951 Moscow in German to Germany 1600 GMT 1 Jul 83

[Vladimir Ostrogorskiy commentary]

[Text] Esteemed listeners, we continue our program with a commentary on the forthcoming USSR visit of Federal Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher. The author, Vladimir Ostrogorskiy, is of the view that the visit may become an important event in international life and a mile-stone in the development of relations between the USSR and the FRG. This, however, is possible only under the condition, Vladimir Ostrogorskiy writes, that the Soviet-FRG summit meeting contributes to solving mankind's urgent issue, meaning the prevention of a global nuclear war.

Are the forthcoming negotiations suited to contribute to solving this problem? Without a doubt, because the leading representatives of two European states will meet in Moscow soon, both of which have a strong economic and technical potential; play a great part in the military-political alliances, whose members they are; and enjoy great international esteem. It is a meeting of the leading representatives from two states who possess rich experiences in successful cooperation; are particularly active in looking out for means to preserve and strengthen peace because their peoples made the biggest sacrifices in World War II, which was unleashed by the Hitlerite clique; and are committed to history and the memory of those fallen in that war.

Moscow and Bonn have underlined repeatedly their determination to remain loyal to the letter and spirit of the Moscow Treaty, which had opened a new era of relations between the two states. The Moscow Treaty is a document which not only formulates the just solution to all disputed issues that existed between our countries, but it is also oriented toward the future. The Moscow Treaty commits its signatories to working together for the strengthening of peace in Europe and to promoting close relations between all European states. It is precisely now that this mutual commitment is of special importance because everything available in good will, positive experiences, and political wisdom must be put on the scales, which as of late are turned more and more distinctly toward confrontation or even military conflict in Europe.

History will not pardon the state leaders if they miss their chance to direct international relations toward cooperation and peace. What actually will Federal Chancellor Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher take along to Moscow? Comment by the FRG press in this respect is varying.

However, commentators who assess the situation unbiased, are discarding beforehand any possibility of reconciling the Soviet Union with NATO's course aimed at a radical change in the approximate strategic parity currently exisiting in the world. And those who foresee the potential consequences of such a course are pointing to its absolute incompatability with the FRG's vital interests, because the continuation of this course would mean to turn the FRG into the starting place for a so-called limited nuclear war in Europe. This precisely is the strategic purpose for the stationing of U.S. first-strike intermediate-range nuclear missiles on our continent.

Helmut Kohl had stressed recently that he would act neither as a mediator nor as an interpreter between the Russians and the Americans in Moscow. But hardly anybody is expecting this of him. The Soviet Union respects the standpoint of any country, in particular if a vital issue, such as the safeguarding of security, is at stake, and if it is one's own view and not that of others.

What is equally important is that one does not strive for being armed with additional nuclear missiles at the expense of the other side, but that one strives for the strengthening of international understanding and cooperation. Besides, it is viewed in the Soviet capital that the German language is not suited for translation from the American language. Just as it used to be more than 10 years ago, when the Soviet-FRG meetings on the highest level had paved the way toward solving bilateral and all-European problems, the German language now could serve to authentically express the FRG's own national interests which acutally correspond to the strengthening of peace, security, and cooperation throughout the European Continent.

## Welcomed by Tikhonov

LD041210 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, July 4 TASS -- Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and foreign minister of the FRG, arrived in Moscow today at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

At Vnukovo Airport the guests were met at the gangway by Nikolay Tikhonov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Andrey Gromyko, first vice chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, foreign minister of the USSR.

The welcoming party also included Leonid Kostandov and Guriy Marchuk, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; Timofey Guzhenko and Ivan Kazanets, USSR ministers; Sergey Lapin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Radio and Television Broadcasting; Sergey Losev, TASS director-general; Vladimir Promysloc, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Soviet; Vladimir Semenov, USSR ambassador to the FRG; Dmitriy Nikiforov and Yuriy Chernyakov, heads of departments at the USSR Foreign Ministry; and other officials.

Welcoming the arrivals were also Andreas Meyer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR, and representatives of the working people of Moscow.

A guard of honor was mounted on the air field, the National anthems of the two countries were played.

Nikolay Tikhonov and Helmut Kohl inspected the guard of honour.

State flags of the FRG and the USSR were hoisted at the airport and in the streets through which the motorcade, escorted by motorcycle outriders, drove.

## Andropov Cancels Scheduled Meeting

NC041036 Paris AFP in English 1029 GMT 4 Jul 83

[by Patrick Mensy]

[Excerpts] Moscow, July 4 (AFP) -- Yuriy Andropov, who cancelled his scheduled meetings today with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl for "personal reasons", has been seriously ill for several weeks, according to Western diplomatic sources.

Soviet officials were today refusing to reveal the reasons for the cancellation, but observers believed that the Soviet leader's physical fatigue was most likely the cause.

In fact, the Soviets are maintaining that despite today's cancellation Mr Andropov will be able to hold a two-hour meeting with Mr Kohl tomorrow.

Later informed diplomatic sources here said Mr. Andropov had cancelled today's talks because of health problems.

The sources said the Soviet Foreign Ministry had told Bonn that the Soviet leader had "slight health problems of a temporary nature".

According to the same sources tomorrow's meeting initially scheduled for early morning, will take place in the afternoon at 3:00 p.m.

## Talks With Tikhonov 4 Jul

LD041643 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- Talks have been held in the Kremlin today between Nikolay Tikhonov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR foreign minister; Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR defence minister; Leonid Kostandov, vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and FRG vice-chancellor, Minister for Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

The talks, which were held in a businesslike and frank atamosphere, covered issues pertaining to bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG and the most topical problems of the present-day international life.

It was pointed out from the Soviet side that the Soviet Union's principled approach to relations with the FRG is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Proceeding from that, the USSR and the FRG did a large amount of work in the seventies, basing themselves on the Moscow Treaty, which was signed on August 12, 1970, for directing their relations into a normal course on the basis of mutual respect, recognition of territorial and political realities, which shaped as a result of the Second World War and post-war development.

The sides declared for widening constructive cooperation between the USSR and the FRG and pointed out that there are objective prerequisites for that.

It was noted that economic cooperation between the USSR and the FRG, bringing tangible mutual benefits, exerts a positive impact on their relations as a whole. There is everything necessary to further deepen this cooperation, which is based on a solid treaty-based legal foundation, profound experience of conducting affairs was accumulated.

[Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 5 July Second Edition carries on page one a TASS report on the 4 July Kremlin talks that renders this passage as: ... deepen this cooperation. It has been placed on the sound legal basis of a treaty and substantial experience of conducting affairs has been accumulated.]

The mutual opinion was expressed that the USSR-FRG Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation plays a useful role in practical realization of economic links.

The parties to negotiations declared for the development of contacts through parliaments, trade unions, youth organizations, and also exchanges in the sphere of science, culture, sport, and tourism.

In discussing international issues much attention was paid to the problem of ensuring European security, the problem which becomes particularly acute in connection with plans of deployment of new American medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe, above all on the territory of the FRG.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that the FRG Government considering the responsibility which rests with it in the given situation, will take a realistic stand on that issue, the stand that would meet the interests of peace and prevention of a nuclear war.

Questions pertaining to the Vienna negotiations on mutual reductions of troops and armaments in central Europe, and also the state of affairs at the Madrid meeting, were touched upon in the course of exchanging opinions. The sides declared for the early completion of the Madrid meeting and convocation of a conference on measures of building up confidence, security and disarmament in Europe.

On his part Helmut Kohl declared for deepening and widening relations between the USSR and the FRG in various fields. In so doing, he stressed that these relations should be those of goodneighborliness and of a long-term character. The starting point for these relations should be the observance of the Moscow Treaty, other treaties and agreements.

Helmut Kohl said that the FRG Government is committed to the policy of peace and renunciation of the use of force. At the same time he stressed the FRG's membership in NATO.

Touching upon the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, the chancellor repeated the known arguments in favour of the NATO's "double-track decision."

Taking part in the talks were:

From the Soviet side -- L.I. Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee; V. S. Semenov, USSR ambassador to the FRG; B.T. Batsanov, assistant to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and A.P. Bondarenko, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

From the West German side -- Ph. Jenninger, minister of state to the Office of Federal Chancellor, V. Schreckenberger, head of the Office of the Federal Chancellor, P. Boenisch, head of the Press and Information Department of the Federal Government; A. Meyer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR; H. Tellschick, head of the Foreign Policy Department of the Office of the Federal Chancellor; E. Ackermann, head of administration of the Office of the Federal Chancellor; F. Pfeffer, head of the Political Department of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

## Kremlin Dinner Held

LD041606 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government have given a dinner in the Kremlin today in honour of FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and FRG vice-chancellor, Minister for Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Present at the dinner from the Soviet side were Nikolay Tikhonov, Geydar Aliyev, Andrey Gromyko, Dmitriy Ustinov, and other officials.

At the dinner, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Tikhonov and Helmut Kohl exchanged speeches which were heard with attention and met with applause.

The dinner was held in a friendly atmosphere.

## Talks With Tikhonov 5 Jul

LD050905 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Talks have been held in the Kremlin today between Nikolay Tikhonov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR foreign minister, Dmitriy Ustinov, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR defence minister; Leonid Kostandov, vice-chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and FRG vice-chancellor, Minister for Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

The talks, which were held in a businesslike and frank atmosphere, covered issues pertaining to bilateral relations between the USSR and the FRG and the most topical problems of the present-day international life.

It was pointed out from the Soviet side that the Soviet Union's principled approach to relations with the FRG is based on the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The sides declared for widening constructive cooperation between the USSR and the FRG and pointed out that there are objective prerequisites for that.

In discussing international issues much attention was paid to the problem of ensuring European security, the problem which becomes particularly acute in connection with plans of deployment of new American medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe, above all on the territory of the FRG.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that the FRG Government, considering the responsibility which rests with it in the given situation, will take a realistic stand on that issue, the stand that would meet the interests of peace and prevention of a nuclear war.

Questions pertaining to the Vienna negotiations on mutual reduction of troops and armaments in central Europe, and also the state of affairs at the Madrid meeting, were touched upon in the course of exchanging opinions. The sides declared for the early completion of the Madrid meeting and convocation of a conference on measures of building up confidence, security, and disarmament in Europe.

On his part Helmut Kohl declared for deepening and widening relations between the USSR and the FRG in various fields. In so doing, he stressed that these relations should be those of goodneighbourliness and of a long-term character. The starting point for these relations should be the observance of the Moscow Treaty, other treaties and agreements.

Helmut Kohl said that the FRG Government is committed to the policy of peace and renunciation of the use of force. At the same time he stressed the FRG's membership in NATO.

Touching upon the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, the chancellor repeated the known arguments in favour of the NATO's "double-track decision."

## Andropov, Kohl Meet

LD050745 Moscow TASS in English 0736 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, have had a conversation at the Kremlin today.

## 'Deadlock' Reported

NC051233 Paris AFP in English 1232 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, July 5 (AFP) -- West Germany and the Soviet Union, in a Kremlin summit lasting two hours here today, failed to break the deadlock over European security, a West German spokesman announced.

The talks were essentially concerned with security and were "tough" on the fundamental issues, Bonn Government spokesman Peter Boenisch said after the meeting between Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Soviet head of state Yuriy Andropov.

The spokesman said Mr Kohl and Mr Andropov had "simply exchanged their respective points of view" concerning the Geneva disarmament talks and West Germany's plan to start deploying U.S. Cruise and Pershing-2 missiles at the end of the year should these talks fail.

Quoting West German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher, the spokesman said the Soviet Union was "holding up the Geneva talks by demanding that French and British missiles be included".

Mr Boenisch confirmed that Mr Andropov had threatened the West with "global counter measures" if West Germany and other Western European countries went ahead with the deployment of the U.S. missiles.

However Chancellor Kohl considered positive the fact that "West Germany and the Soviet Union think there might still be time to reach an agreement in Geneva before the end of the year", Mr Boenisch said.

Chancellor Kohl also told Mr Andropov that he was in favour of pursuing the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks even after deployment of the new U.S. arms.

"The Soviet Union did not react directly to this suggestion but it didn't formally oppose it either," Mr Boenisch said.

The spokesman said Mr Andropov had accepted "without hesitation" an invitation from Chancellor Kohl to visit West Germany at a future date. "The main thing for West Germany and the chancellor is to get a better understanding of the new Soviet leadership under present conditions," Mr Boenisch said.

Asked about Mr Andropov's health, the spokesman quoting Mr Kohl said "the chancellor had the impression that the Soviet leader moved with difficulty but he reacted rapidly to all the questions and he spoke throughout the meeting without notes."

### Gromyko, Genscher Meet

LD050831 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Text] A meeting took place in the Kremlin today between Comrade Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and Genscher, federal vice chancellor, FRG minister of foreign affairs.

Questions of bilateral relations were examined as were some international problems of mutual interest.

Helmut Kohl, federal chancellor of the FRG, and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal vice chancellor and minister of foreign affairs of the FRG, laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall today. The guests were accompanied by Comrade Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and by other officials.

### FRG Reportage

For FRG reportage on Chancellor Helmut Kohl's expectations, itinerary, arrival, and talks in Moscow, including the 4 July postponement of his meeting with state and party leader Yuriy Andropov, see the Federal Republic of Germany section of the 5 July Western Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

## U.S. VICE PRESIDENT'S W. EUROPE TOUR CONTINUES

### Observer on Norway Visit

LD021906 Moscow in Finnish to Finland 1530 GMT 30 Jun 83

[Text] U.S. Vice President George Bush is currently visiting Norway. Our observer writes the following:

On leaving Sweden, the U.S. vice president said that the stay there pleased him more than in the FRG. This was so despite the fact that a protest demonstration was held in Stockholm against the plans by the Washington administration. Judging from everything, in Norway certain circles attempted to do everything so that Bush would feel even better there than in Sweden.

Naturally, one cannot organize a demonstration in Norway in favor of the U.S. missile plans, but other actions can be held there. At the base on the island of Andoyea in Norway, which is prepated to receive planes with nuclear cargoes, a glimpse of something which was enthusiastically identified as a submarine periscope immediately resulted in warships being sent to the scene and an outcry on the part of the press.

In such a situation it is, of course, easier for Bush to reject the idea of a nuclear-free zone, to urge fresh sacrifices to strengthen the northern flank of NATO and to speak about the so-called Soviet threat. At any rate the Norwegian prime minister deserved his guest's praise for the contribution to NATO's defense and for supporting the two-track decision on missiles.

Meanwhile, an attitude like that of Norway also helps the Americans to bring the Geneva talks to deadlock. By temporising and taking advantage of the support of its European NATO partners, the United States can concentrate all its powers on achieving military superiority over the USSR. At present the entire U.S. might is directed at the deployment of missiles.

The present European tour by Bush is also subordinated to this goal. With typical U.S. fighting spirit he fights for every vote, whether in West Germany or Iceland. As for the Geneva talks, according to Bush the Americans are expecting steps from the USSR which would help progress in these talks. But is there any need to break through an open door? The USSR long ago announced its readiness to agree that it would leave itself exactly as many missiles in the European part of the country as Britain and France have together. Many Europeans understand such a stance by the USSR and favor it. A growing number of them protest against the dangerous arms drive by Washington. Indeed, these protests forced the White House to send to Europe a missile peddler whom certain authorities in Norway greet with strange hospitality.

## Visits Finland; Dinner Held

LD022130 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 2 Jul 83

[Text] Helsinki July 2 TASS -- Finalnd's Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa has declared for the speediest attainment of positive results at the Geneva talks, which would considerably lessen the threat of a nuclear war breaking out. Addressing a dinner given here today on the occasion of the visit to Finland of U.S. Vice President George Bush, Kalevi Sorsa said that Finland consistently and actively supports the strivings aimed at placing both nuclear and conventional types of weapons under effective control. The rapidly developing nuclear technology has made the attainment of progress in that field even more difficult, but at the same time even more important, the prime minister said.

The main objective of Finland's foreign policy, Kalevi Sorsa pointed out, is a strengthening of a stable and constructive atmosphere in Nordic Europe. He described as an extremely important factor the establishment after the war of good-neighborly relations between Finland and the Soviet Union.

Neutrality does not stand for indifference to international issues. On the contrary, from the viewpoint of Finalnd's interests, there is a vital need for vigorous activities, especially within the U.N. framework and the process, which was started by the Conference on European Security and Cooperation. This is particularly important in the conditions when the threat of nuclear war remains yet a part of our everyday realities. The continuation of the process started in Helsinki in 1975 is a paramount objective for Finland, said Kalevi Sorsa.

## Leaves Finland for Denmark

LD030902 Moscow TASS in English 0829 GMT 3 Jul 83

[Text] Helsinki July 3 TASS -- The official visit to Finland by U.S. Vice President George Bush ended today. During the visit, he held talks with President Mauno Koivisto of Finland and with the country's Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa.

## Danish Visit Critiqued

LD041749 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 4 Jun 83

["A Feint" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Vladimir Serov writes:

Speaking in Copenhagen, U.S. Vice President George Bush has said that the United States is allegedly energetically working to promote attainment of positive results at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva.

Such a statement could have only be welcomed, had it not been though to some extent in line with reality. But facts testify to the contrary. Having set the aim to deploy its new nuclear missiles in Western Europe, exactly Washington is doing its utmost to doom the Geneva negotiations to a failure. No other person but the U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger reaffirmed the line of sabotage, of failure of these negotiations. On the eve of the NATO Council's session he directly said that Washington proceeds from the premise that the agreement in Geneva will not be signed, and is making preparations at full swing for deployment of American missiles in Western Europe.

Statements of a number of high-placed representatives of the Washington administration, including President Reagan, are done in the spirit that, allegedly, it will be easier to come to agreement after the deployment of new American missiles in Europe. This is a serious delusion. As was most definitely emphasized in the Soviet Government's recent statement, if the accord on limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, which excludes deployment of new American missiles there, is thwarted and an additional threat to the security of the USSR and its allies is thus created, the Soviet Union will take timely and efficient retaliatory steps.

Mr. Bush not at all accidentally chose exactly Copenhagen for his declarations on "U.S. striving" for positive results at the negotiations. There is every indication that Washington's emissary is thus trying to influence the Danish parliament and to impel it to revise its recent decision which is not suitable to the United States. It is to be recalled that late in May the Danish parliament by a majority of votes made it incumbent upon the Danish Government to declare for deferment of implementation on the NATO's decision on deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe late in 1983. Preparations for deployment of these missiles should not be conducted as long as negotiations are under way in Geneva. Meanwhile, Washington, feigning its striving for successful completion of the negotiations, launched preparations at full swing for deployment of missiles.

But however, Mr Bush will hardly mislead the Danish public by his feint.

Arrives in Ireland

LD041952 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Dublin July 4 TASS -- Representatives of Irish public have met U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who came here today, with a demonstration of protest. The demonstrators marched to the U.S. Embassy, which was guarded by heavy police duty details, with posters saying "Peace, not Bullets", "USA, Get Out of Central America".

ZIMYANIN-LED DELEGATION FINISHES UP PARIS VISIT

Meets Prime Minister

LD301349 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 30 Jun 83

[Text] Paris June 30 TASS - Mikhail Zimyanin today had a meeting with the Prime Minister of France Pierre Mauroy.

Secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR V. V. Zagladin and the USSR Ambassador in France Y. M. Vorontsov took part in the conversation that passed in a spirit of mutual respect. Discussed first of all were questions of further developing Franco-Soviet relations in the interests of peace and the security of peoples.

Talks Conclude

LD301154 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 30 Jun 83

[Text] Paris June 30 TASS - A delegation of the Foreign Relations Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Mikhail Zimyanin, deputy chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and a delegation of the Foreign Relations Commission of the National Assembly of France completed their meetings here today.

At their final meeting the two delegations summed up the results of their discussion of key international problems. They paid special attention to the question of deepening cooperation between Soviet and French parliamentarians in the resolution of issues related to turning back the threat of war, preserving peace, and enhancing detente. The Soviet delegation emphasised that in the present, complicated international situation, which has come to exist as a direct result of the U.S. Administration's aggressive policy of the arms race, the Soviet Union is consistently upholding the principles of peaceful coexistence and detente.

Both delegations stressed the importance of the frank exchange of opinions, which has taken place, and pointed out the need to continue contacts between parliamentarians of the two countries with a view to deepening Soviet-French cooperation, which meets the interests of France and the Soviet Union. It was emphasized that the existing differences in the two countries' approaches to a number of international problems should not prevent the development of bilateral links between France and the USSR, which are an important factor of European and world peace.

SHULTZ RETURNS FOR SECOND MIDDLE EASTERN TOUR

Mideast Tour Motives Assessed

LD041254 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Beirut July 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Leonid Volnov writes: U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz opens today his second Middle Eastern tour for the past two months with visiting Saudi Arabia. Later, he intends to visit Syria, Israel, and Lebanon. U.S. diplomacy is trying to create the impression that Shultz's coming efforts in the Middle Eastern countries will have the aim to impart "smoothness" to the U.S. course in the region. It is common knowledge, however, that the U.S. policy in the region which is based on the notorious "Reagan plan" is aimed at compelling Arab countries to go along with the United States' military-expansionist plans.

One of the main aims of the visit, as local observers note, is to exert pressure on Syria to try to make it give up opposition to the U.S.-Israeli plans to establish their domination in the region. A special role in the U.S. efforts is assigned to further pressure on Lebanon under the guise of a "balanced approach" and "mediation" between Beirut and Tel Aviv.

These diplomatic "manoeuvres" assume special significance in the light of the latest statements of the Israeli ruling circles in connection with the so-called "redeployment" of forces which, changing nothing in essence, might serve as an additional means of pressure on Lebanon toward the implementation of the Israeli demands of the so-called "normalization" of relations with Lebanon.

As is known, Lebanon comes out against all plans of "partial withdrawal" or "redeployment" of Israeli forces believing that they are aimed at splitting the country. It is held here, that during Shultz's visit, Lebanon intends to submit to him a working document envisaging the schedule of the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon's territory.

A statement of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Lebanese Communist Party published here says that Washington is blackmailing the Lebanese authorities, is supporting Israel's plans of partial withdrawal instead of complete withdrawal of occupation forces. The Lebanese Communist Party urges all progressive forces in Lebanon to come out persistently against the U.S.-Israeli threats and to give a resolute rebuff to the so-called "American option".

It is noted in the Lebanese political circles that the efforts of U.S. diplomacy taken hastily attest to the deadlock of the U.S. policy from the positions of strength in the Middle East.

'Fresh Conspiracy'

LD051048 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Vladimir Bilyakov commentary from the "Window on the Arab World" program]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has returned to the Middle East. The aim of his visit, hurriedly decided by President Reagan, is to rescue American Middle East diplomacy from the deadlock, resulting from what is termed as the Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement. This agreement was laid down by the United States of America and signed 1 and 1/2 months ago, but still remains only in ink because American diplomacy has been unable to secure Arab support for it.

On the contrary: disappointment over this agreement is growing in Lebanon itself, and Lebanese officials are dropping hints more frequently that they had been tricked, regrettably. According to world press reports, it appears that the United States of America and Israel believe that the way out of the impasse is a partial withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, especially from the Ash Shuf mountain region.

A correspondent of the American NBC Television company says that such a withdrawal is planned to begin in August. The idea of a partial withdrawal of Israeli forces already had been discussed during the recent visit to Washington by David Kimche, director general of the Israeli Foreign Ministry. As for a final decision on this matter, all signs show that it will be made after the meeting between President Reagan and the Israeli prime minister in Washington later this month.

Before this, the United States of America hopes to secure the agreement of Lebanon, whose President Amin al-Jumayyil, is scheduled to visit Washington 1 week before Begin. Perhaps is it in the context of preparations for these two summit meetings, that one should consider Shultz' present visit to the Middle East.

What are the objectives sought by a partial withdrawal of Israel's forces from Lebanon? They are numerous: First of all, the United States of America and Israel want to portray this as evidence of their aspiration for peace, and thus encourage certain Arab regimes to join the disreputable Reagan plan. Second, the Begin government hopes to strengthen its domestic political position by such a step.

As is known, the occupants are suffering heavy casualties as a result of the active operations of the Lebanese fedayin. A partial withdrawal of the Israeli forces and their reduction would enable the Zionists to reduce their losses and disperse the wave of the antiwar movement in their own country.

Third, a partial withdrawal of Israeli forces would enable the United States of America to increase its military presence in Lebanon, and turn it into a bridgehead for its anti-Arab Rapid Deployment Force. As the REUTER agency puts it, Israel wants to leave its positions for the multinational forces. On its part, NBC said that in such a case, a considerable increase of the American marines in Lebanon would be inevitable.

Finally, by stopping at the Awwali River, the Israelis hope to entrench themselves in southern Lebanon.

The British paper THE TIMES wrote: The general staff of the Israeli Army has finished plans for a long-term occupation of southern Lebanon. This brings to mind Kissinger's shuttle tours in the Middle East when he was in Shultz' post as American secretary of state. The former also had, at the time, undertaken his tours carrying with him the plans for a partial withdrawal of Israeli forces. It is very well known how this ended up: Egypt recovered Sinai but only in return for a unilateral surrender treaty with Israel. As for the Syrian Golan Heights -- where there also had been a partial withdrawal by the Zionist forces at the time -- well, Israel decided in the end to annex them completely.

For this reason, the present plans by the United States of America and Israel are a fresh conspiracy against the Arabs, seeking to impose American-Israeli domination in the region.

'Green Light' for Israel

LD051039 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 5 Jul 83

[Report by correspondent Leonid Rassadin, from Beirut]

[Text] The head of the American foreign policy department has arrived in Saudi Arabia.

So far, his further itinerary has not been announced in detail, but it is known that he will certainly visit Israel where he will meet the leaders of that country. Why has the U.S. secretary of state returned to the Middle East again? In answering this question, the Damascus paper AL-BA'TH writes: "We have already satisfied ourselves on more than one occasion that each visit by a high-ranking American figure to the Middle East region has been followed by either aggression by Israel or a fresh dangerous political conspiracy against the Arabs."

One cannot help agreeing with the opinion of the influential Damascus newspaper. In Arab political circles, it is not excluded that during Shultz's stay in Tel Aviv, there will be detailed discussion of the scenario -- and perhaps several versions of it -- for further actions by Israel which has for several months now been openly preparing for an attack on the Syrian Arab Republic.

In Beirut, too, they are also extremely worried about the growing rumors of plans for a so-called redeployment of the Israeli interventionist' army in Lebanon. The alarm of the Lebanese is understandable. It is not by any means a question of the Israeli interventionists intending to occupy military positions that would be more comfortable from their point of view; it is a question of an extremely dangerous design by the rulers of Tel Aviv which will consolidate for a long time the effective partition of Lebanon, and the occupation by Israeli aggressors of a considerable part of Lebanese territory. And so Shultz is (?off) to Israel to give the aggressor the green light to carry out its expansionist plans concerning the sovereign Lebanese Republic. One's attention is drawn to a report on Israel Radio which declared that the U.S. secretary of state will propose an increase in the strength of the multinational forces located in the Lebanon. Their spearhead is composed of American marines. The Pentagon is obviously striving in this way to turn Lebanon into a stronghold of the American military in the Middle East so as to threaten the Arab national liberation movement and keep in its gunsights a strategically and economically important region of the globe.

## PRAVDA CITES ARAB CP SUPPORT FOR SYRIA

PM011559 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Support for Syria's Stance"]

[Text] Damascus, 30 Jun -- Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad has met here with a delegation of leaders of Arab countries' communist and workers parties headed by Khalid Bakdash, general secretary of the Syrian Communist Party Central Committee, and 'Aziz Muhammad, first secretary of the Iraqi Communist Party Central Committee.

The delegation members declared their support for Syria's stance on the Lebanese-Israeli agreement signed under U.S. pressure and also for its policy of firm opposition to the notorious "Reagan plan" and other schemes by the forces of international imperialism and Zionism in the region. They condemned the political and diplomatic pressure exerted by imperialist circles on Syria's leadership in connection with its principled policy in the Near East.

## BALTIC MILITARY MANEUVERS CONCLUDE 4 JULY

LD041652 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 4 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow, July 4 TASS — Military exercises of the troops and naval forces of the USSR Armed Forces were held from June 29 to July 4 on the territory of the Baltic Region, Belorussia and in the Baltic Sea under the command of the USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov.

Trained during the exercises were combat coordination and cooperation during joint operations of the units of arms and services.

According to the command, the exercises were held in a well-organized way and were instructive. They showed the increased level of the operational and tactical training and staffs, as well as of field, air and sea training of the troops and naval forces.

Targets set at the exercises have been achieved. The troops, naval forces and staffs, which took part in the military exercises, are returning to the zones of their permanent deployment.

## USTINOV ADDRESSES PARATROOPERS ON READINESS

PM021926 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel B. Karpov report: "USSR Defense Minister Visits Guards Paratroopers"]

[Text] During the exercises in the Baltic region Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, met with the servicemen of the N [not further identified] Guards Airborne Regiment.

The regiment has been awarded an order for its successes in combat and political training. The servicemen operated confidently in the tactical exercise observed by the defense minister. He made a high assessment of the guards paratroopers' tactical, fire, and special training and moral and psychological tempering.

The defense minister familiarized himself with the organization and methods of the paratroopers' training and with their study and training base.

At a meeting with personnel of the regiment, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov noted that all Soviet people and the servicemen of the Armed Forces are now living and working under the impression of the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and the speech delivered at it by Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the party Central Committee.

The plenum examined questions of improving ideological work and the ideological and political education of Soviet people and paths of the further building of the developed socialist society in our country. The Soviet people ardently approved and supported the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee plenum. They have perceived the party's cause as their own vital cause, and are struggling to successfully implement the tasks outlined by the party.

The ardent approval and utter [vsemernyy] support of all Soviet people and Army and Navy servicemen was evoked by the election at the Eighth USSR Supreme Soviet Session of Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the supreme state post -- chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

People in our country, the defense minister continued, and abroad as well, know Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov as a principled communist, a loyal and unshakable Marxist-Lennist, and a consistent internationalist. He has earned deep respect in our party and country by his thoughtful approach to solving the most important problems of our time and his tireless organizing activity in communist building. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov pays great attention to strengthening peace on earth and our country's international prestige and to increasing its defense capability. He takes a constant interest in the life and combat training of the Armed Forces. The USSR defense minister conveyed to the participants in the current exercises combat greetings and wishes for success in training from Comrade Yu. V. Andropov.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov went on to speak aobut our country's life and the Soviet people's successful fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the targets of the 11th 5-Year Plan. The equator of the plan has now been crossed, he stressed. Labor and production discipline are strengthening and labor productivity is growing.

The international situation is causing us great concern. The United States has adopted a course toward world domination. It has based this course on shameless anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. Last year U.S. President Reagan announced a "crusade" against communism. That is not mere talk. It is backed by action. The United States and its NATO allies are persistently building up military preparations with the intention of securing military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact in order to dictate to us how to live and conduct our affairs. That is an extremely dangerous course.

The Soviet Union has put forward a number of important initiatives on ending the arms race and preventing nuclear war. These initiatives are clearly set out in a number of Comrade Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's speeches. They could become a good basis in improving the international climate and relations between the USSR and the United States. But the Reagan administration is effectively rejecting our proposals and is working toward sabotaging the talks in Geneva and Vienna on the limitation and reduction of armaments and armed forces.

An especially dangerous U.S. action is the preparation for the deployment of its medium-range nuclear missile facilities in West European countries at the end of this year. These weapons will not only lead to a destabilization of the situation in Europe but will also directly create a nuclear threat to the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Of course the USSR, with its allies, will take all measures to safeguard our countries' security. This was again firmly stated at the recent Moscow meeting of the socialist states' leading party and state figures.

Our task under these conditions, the defense minister stressed, is to tirelessly strengthen the country's defense capability and increase the Armed Forces' combat readiness. In short, to do everything to ensure that the enemy does not take us unawares. In any eventuality, in any adventure he must receive a fitting and crushing rebuff!

You are serving in the wonderful airborne forces, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov continued, and you are proud of your speciality, you wear your blue berets and striped jerseys with love. However, your uniform is not only an outward distinguishing mark, it is also evidence of great military skill and excellent professional training. Paratroopers are now equipped with modern artillery and missile systems, airborne combat vehicles, and anti-aircraft weapons. With such weapons you are capable of carrying out any tasks. But this requires of you not only masterly airborne landings, but also the skillful utilization of equipment in battle. The paratrooper has a vital need of great physical fitness, dexterity, endurance, boldness and the ability of conduct combat operations successfully in the most complex conditions. You must acauire all this in the course of combat training. We have seen for ourselves today that you have a good training material base, making it possible to mold and instill all these wonderful qualities.

Paratroopers are highly conscious, ideologically tempered, bold, resolute and resourceful people. And it is certainly unfitting for you to have laggards and poorly trained people in your ranks. Good- and excellent-rated airborne landing training, exemplary organization and discipline, and constant high combat readiness must be the bright distinuishing feature of every paratrooper and every airborne unit. The defense minister expressed the confidence that the paratroopers will successfully cope with this task, and he wished them great success in martial labor.

The USSR defense minister was accompanied on his visit to the regiment by Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General A.A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, commander of the Airborne Troops; and other military leaders.

OGARKOV HEADS EDITORS OF MILITARY DICTIONARY

PM241305 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 83 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Military Encyclopedic Dictionary"]

[Text] A Military Encyclopedic Dictionary has been published. It was compiled under the leadership of a main editorial commission headed by Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov.

This one-volume scientific reference publication is intended for a wide range of readers interested in military matters. It gives a concise explanation of the concepts and terms reflecting the current state of the science and art of war and the basic stages of their development. The dictionary contains articles devoted to the major decisions taken by the CPSU and the Soviet Government on military issues, to Lenin's behests on the defense of the socialist fatherland, and to topical problems of war and politics and other problems. The dictionary devotes much space to the glorious victories won by the Soviet people and their Armed Forces under the leadership of the Communist Party during the years of the harsh trials -- the Civil and the Great Patriotic wars. It gives biographical information about Russian, Soviet and foreign generals and military leaders, war heroes, and major scientists and inventors. The Military Encyclopedic Dictionary contains a total of 14,000 articles and some 1,700 color and black-and-white maps, diagrams, drawings and photographs.

This is the first time that a dictionary of this kind has been published in the Soviet Union. Preparations for the publication were carried out by the Institute of Military History and the Military Publishing House.